National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 86/01)

Canada

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

152

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

TC –

0-315-23349-4

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE SERVICE – SERVICE DES THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

PERMISION TO MICROFILM – AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type – Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

AUTHOR – AUTEUR

Full Name of Author – Nom complet de l'auteur

Bonny Joan Watkins

Date of Birth – Date de naissance

August 25, 1947

Canadian Citizen – Citoyen canadien

☑ Yes / Oui ☐ No / Non

Country of Birth – Lieu de naissance

Indonesia

Permanent Address – Résidence fixe

3808 - 114 Street

THESIS – THÈSE

Title of Thesis – Titre de la thèse

An Exploration of Writing Apprehension in Grade Six Children

Degree for which thesis was presented
Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Master of Education

Year this degree conferred
Année d'obtention de ce grade

1985

University – Université

University of Alberta

Name of Supervisor – Nom du directeur de thèse

Dr. R. K. Jackson

AUTHORIZATION – AUTORISATION

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to **microfilm** this thesis and to **lend** or **sell copies of the film.**

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de **microfilmer** cette thèse et de **prêter** ou de **vendre des exemplaires du film.**

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

ATTACH FORM TO THESIS – VEUILLEZ JOINDRE CE FORMULAIRE À LA THÈSE

Signature

B. Watkins

Date

October 10, 1985

NL-91 (r. 84/03)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN EXPLORATION OF WRITING APPREHENSION IN GRADE SIX STUDENTS

by

© Bonny Joan Watkins

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Bonny Joan Watkins

TITLE OF THESIS: An Exploration of Writing Apprehension in Grade Six Students.

DEGREE: Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE WAS GRANTED: 1985

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

B Watkins

3808 - 114 Street
Edmonton, Alberta

Date: October 10, 1985

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled, "An Exploration of Writing Apprehension In Grade Six Students" submitted by Bonny Joan Watkins, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Education.

R. K. Jackson

W. Dwilde

John E. Oster

Date: September 24, 1985

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my son, Jeffrey, in the hopes that he will never be apprehensive about the things in life that really matter.

ABSTRACT

Although research examining the relationship between writing apprehension and the written product and the writing process is still in its infancy, a few studies have indicated that attitudes toward writing may have an effect upon the writing growth of students. Since elementary students are at the beginning stages of developing mastery in the skills required for good writing, a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between the writing apprehension construct and the language product and the writing process may serve as a useful aid to instructional practice.

The purpose of this study was to examine the written products and the writing processes of high apprehensive writers. Low apprehensive writers were compared to high apprehensive writers. The sample, four high and four low apprehensive writers were identified by means of the Writing Apprehension Test.

To gather data on the relationship between the construct and the written product, students were asked to write extemperaneously on a predetermined topic. The data was analyzed for a number of quantitative and qualitative features.

To gather data on the relationship between the

construct and the writing process, students were asked to "think aloud" while composing. Each composing session was videotaped and audiotaped. The audiotapes were transcribed and analyzed and the analysis resulted in a coding scheme which was then applied in a second and third analysis.

Students were also asked to view the videotapes and were required to comment retrospectively about the writing process. The retrospective comments together with the introspective comments were used to profile one high and one low apprehensive student.

Findings indicated that high apprehensive writers tended to write shorter stories and that they were evaluated less positively than low apprehensive writers.

On the relationship between writing apprehension and the writing process, it was found that both groups demonstrated greatest concern for Planning which was followed by Rehearsing. However, the nature in which these major process categories were employed differed. The study also concluded that although differences in the way both groups employed the writing process could be discerned, within group differences were also apparent indicating that the writing process is frequently unique to the individual writer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to a number of individuals who encouraged and assisted me in the completion of this thesis.

My advisor, Dr. R.K. Jackson, for allowing me the freedom to explore my own thinking and for always being there whenever he was needed.

Dr. W. Wilde who helped to refine my thinking and whose suggestions were always greatly appreciated.

Dr. J. Oster whose in-depth questioning helped cast further light upon this thesis.

The teachers and all the students who so willingly gave of their time and without whose support this thesis could not have been written.

Geraldine Dunsmore and Veronica Hellweg for their superb assistance in providing the inter-rater reliability needed for this study.

Ruth Hayden who so frequently provided some comic relief and for always agreeing that a messy office was at times really kind of neat.

My parents, Arthur and Anne Ferguson, and my brothers, Ed, Henri and Mark, who always believed in me. Their love and support sustained me throughout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
	Overview	1
	Introduction	1
	The Problem	4
	Purpose of the Study	5
	Definitions	6
	Research Questions	7
	Limitations of the Study	8
	Significance of the Study	9
	Organization of the Study	10
II	SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
	Overview	13
	Research on Writing Apprehension	13
	Writing Apprehension and the Written Language Product	20
	Writing Apprehension and the Writing Process	26
	Summary and Rationale	34
III	THE DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	36
	Overview	36
	The Design	36
	Sample Selection	38
	The Instrument	41
	The Writing Apprehension Test	41
	The Writing Task	43
	Data Gathering Procedures	45

CHAPTER PAGE

The Writing Apprehension Scores 46

The Language Product 47

The Writing Process 48

The Pilot Study 53

Procedures 54

Results 55

Summary 55

IV ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 58

Overview 58

The Writing Apprehension Test--Revised 58

The Written Language Product 59

The Writing Process 61

Definitions of Components in the Writing Process 68

Summary 78

V FINDINGS OF THE STUDY 80

Overview 80

The Written Language Product 80

Research Question 1 81

Research Question 2 83

Research Question 3 85

Discussion 87

The Writing Process 91

Research Question 4 91

Research Question 5 99

Research Question 6 107

CHAPTER PAGE

Discussion 112

The Relationship Between the Written Product and the Writing Process 118

Research Question 7 118

Discussion 124

The Profiles 128

High Apprehensive Writer: Cynthia 128

Low Apprehensive Writer: Sue 136

Discussion 140

Summary 145

VI SUMMARY 150

Overview 150

Summary of the Study 150

Conclusions 153

The Written Language Product 154

Discussion 154

The Writing Process 158

Discussion 158

The Relationship Between the Written Language Product And the Writing Process 162

Discussion 162

The Profiles 164

Discussion 165

Implications For Teaching 169

Recommendations For Further Research 175

CHAPTER PAGE

Sum 177

REFERENCE 178

APPENDIX A 183

APPENDIX B 187

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Quantitative Analysis of the Written Products -- High Apprehensive Writers	82
2	Qualitative Analysis of the Written Products -- High Apprehensive Writers	82
3	Quantitative Analysis of the Written Products -- Low Apprehensive Writers	84
4	Qualitative Analysis of the Written Products -- Low Apprehensive Writers	84
5	Quantitative Analysis of the Written Products -- High and Low Apprehensive Writers	86
6	Qualitative Analysis of the Written Products -- High and Low Apprehensive Writers	86
7	Classification of Statements According to the Major Process Categories -- High Apprehensive Group	92
8	Classification of Statements According to the Minor Process Categories -- High Apprehensive Group	93
9	Classification of Statements According to the Major Process Categories -- Low Apprehensive Group	100
10	Classification of Statements According to the Minor Process Categories -- Low Apprehensive Group	101
11	Comparisons of Statements According to the Major Process Categories -- High and Low Apprehensive Group	108

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Overview

This chapter introduces the general nature and the purpose of the study. It presents the problem, defines important terms, poses the research questions and articulates the limitations and significance of the study. The concluding section of this chapter presents a general overview of the thesis.

Introduction

That one of the basic aims of most language arts programs is to promote the writing competencies of students is axiomatic. Yet, the literacy crisis, a national concern, questions the very adequacy with which schools are meeting the writing needs of children. While many question the existence of the so called "writing decline", denial of the problem does not erase public concern. In fact, the plethora of articles, books and public debates lamenting the

writing competencies of students are indicators that the problem is thought to be pervasive.

In the wake of this furor, increased research attention is being directed towards a more comprehensive understanding of the writing phenomenon. Recent trends in writing research, for example, have examined the written language products of children for a number of quantitative indices and qualitative components, investigated the nature of the writing process and have begun to couple concern for the above two dimensions with the individual difference variables among writers. The last approach in writing research attempts to develop an understanding of how people differ and how these differences affect the written language product and the writing process.

That children differ in their attitudes toward writing has long been recognized by teachers and parents. Holladay, (1981) suggests, however, that teachers, for the most part, "... have de-emphasized the important role attitudes play in learning to write." (p,2). From recent research evidence Holladay (1981) extrapolates her observation that growth in writing is very much influenced by the particular attitudes students hold toward writing. Book (1976), Daly (1985), Garcia (1978) and Selfe (1984) have

reiterated the importance of attitudes to learning to write in their respective studies.

Attitudes toward writing are generally identifiable by students' predispositions toward writing. When predisposition toward writing is viewed along a continuum, ranging from total writing avoidance to an eagerness to participate in the writing encounter, various shades of writing attitudes can be discerned. Researchers have variously labelled students who display a negative attitude toward writing and who, therefore, avoid situations requiring writing whenever possible as reluctant writers, anxious writers and/or apprehensive writers. It is concern for the reluctant or apprehensive writer which has stimulated the research in this thesis.

Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) and others have researched the writing apprehension construct and have generally concluded that attitudes toward writing play a powerful role in learning to write. These authors have suggested that a negative attitude toward writing may negatively affect the written language product. They also suggest that the writing processes of students who view writing negatively differ from the writing processes of students who possess positive feelings about the writing encounter.

A panoramic review of the research exploring the writing apprehension construct indicates that these studies have largely involved older students - high school and undergraduate students. If attitudes toward writing affect the language products and the writing processes of these students, research must also come to understand this relationship in the elementary student because knowledge of this relationship provides a more comprehensive understanding of the writing apprehension construct. Moreover, examining the construct in elementary-school-aged children may trace the onset of writing apprehension and provide further insight into the relationship between the construct and the written product and the writing process.

The Problem

The initial focus of this study concerns an exploration of writing apprehension among grade six students. Current literature investigating the construct has suggested that writing apprehension affects growth in writing and that negative attitudes toward writing can be a debilitating handicap (Book, 1976; Daly, 1975; Faigley, Daly and Witte, 1981; Veit, 1980). Moreover, these same authors also suggest that

attitudes toward writing may also have an effect upon the written language product while Selfe (1984) has found that writing apprehension affects the nature of the writing process. Since the majority of studies which have examined the writing apprehension construct have tended to focus concern upon the high school and undergraduate student, little is known about the relationship between writing apprehension and the written product and the writing process in the elementary student. To this end, therefore, the present study extends previous research on writing apprehension by focussing upon the elementary student and explores the extent to which attitudes toward writing affect the written product and the writing process of younger students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine high apprehensive grade six writers by describing, analyzing and interpreting the nature of their written work and the nature of the writing process in which they engage. Low apprehensive grade six writers are also examined in a similar manner and compared to high apprehensive writers in order to further understand high

apprehensive writers.

Definitions

The following terms are defined as they are used in the study.

Writing Apprehension: describes "... an individual difference characterized by a general avoidance of writing and situations perceived by the individual to potentially require some amount of writing ." (Daly, 1979, p.37).

High Apprehensive Writers: Those grade six students who placed in the top ten percent on the Writing Apprehension Test and whose teachers' perceptions and observations support the view that these students generally tend to avoid situations requiring writing.

Low Apprehensive Writers: Those grade six students who placed in the bottom ten percent on the Writing Apprehension Test and whose teachers' perceptions and observations support the view that these students generally tend to willingly approach situations requiring writing.

Introspective Comments: Overt verbalizations of covert mental activity while engaged in the writing process.

Retrospective Comments: Statements made by students about their writing process after the completion of a composing session when viewing a videotape of their writing encounter.

T-unit: A basic unit of language which consists of an independent clause with all its modifiers.

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed by this study.

The Written Language Product

1. What is the nature of the written products produced by high apprehensive writers?
2. What is the nature of the written products produced by low apprehensive writers?
3. How are the written products of the two groups similar and/or different?

The Writing Process

4. What is the nature of the writing process employed by high apprehensive writers?

5. What is the nature of the writing process employed by low apprehensive writers?

6. How are the writing processes employed by the two groups similar and/or different?

Relationships

7. Is there a relationship between the written products and the writing processes of high apprehensive and low apprehensive writers?

Limitations of the Study

A number of factors limited this study in the following ways:

1. The small sample constrains generalizability.

2. Since the singular writing task is narrative in nature, the conclusions cannot be generalized to other modes of written discourse.

3. The young age of the sample may affect their

verbalizations of the information required in the "think-aloud" technique used in this study.

4. The videotaping, the audiotaping and the presence of the researcher may adversely affect the performance of the subjects.

Significance of the Study

Very little research has linked concern for the writing apprehension construct with elementary school age children. Most studies, instead, have focussed upon the high school and undergraduate student. While some of these studies have investigated the effect of writing apprehension upon the writing process, most studies have explored the relationship between the construct and the written language product.

This study focusses upon writing apprehension in grade six students by combining concern for the construct with the written language product and the writing process. To this end, this study could help shed light not only upon the onset of writing apprehension but also upon the relationship that may exist between children's attitudes toward writing, their writing processes and their written language products. In coming to understand these relationships, the research findings may serve as a useful aid to instructional practice.

The procedures used in this study yielded a coding

scheme for analyzing the writing processes of students. This coding scheme delineates a number of components which constituted the writing processes of the students who participated in the present study. This coding scheme, with some modifications, depending upon the group being investigated, may be useful in other research projects.

This study explored the effect of writing apprehension, an attitudinal variable, upon the writing of grade six students. It indicated that attitudes play a powerful role in learning to write. To this end, the results of this study may lead to further research examining the effect of the affective domain on writing.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I outlined the general nature and the purpose of the study. It introduced the writing apprehension construct and the need for further research which focusses upon the elementary school age child. The purpose of the study was identified in relation to the questions with which the study is concerned. It also defined terms in order to make explicit the study's frame of reference. Moreover, it listed the limitations inherent in the study and indicated the significance of the study.

Chapter II presents a survey of the literature pertinent

to this study. The content of this chapter is organized into four major sections. The first section introduces the writing apprehension construct by surveying related research orientations and studies examining the individual difference correlates of writing apprehension. The second and third sections respectively examine the relationship between the construct and the written language product and the statements made about the writing process. The final section presents the chapter summary and a rationale for the study.

Chapter III presents the design and procedures used to gather data in the study which will yield insight into the research questions posed in Chapter I.

Chapter IV discusses the method of analysis. For each major type of data gathered, this chapter reviews the methods that were used to analyze the data.

Chapter V presents the results of the data which were analyzed. This chapter is organized into four sections. While the first section reports the findings of the relationship between writing apprehension and the written product, the second section reports the findings of the relationship between the construct and the statements made about the writing process. The third section reports on the relationship between the written product and the writing process of high and low apprehensive writers. The final section supplements answers to the individual research

questions by profiling one low and one high apprehensive writer.

Chapter VI presents a general summary of the entire study as well as the research conclusions, recommendations for further study and instructional implications.

Chapter II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Overview

The principal goal of this chapter is to present a survey of the literature pertinent to this study. The discussion is organized into four major sections. The first section introduces the writing apprehension construct by surveying related fields of research and reviewing studies which indicate that the construct forms relationships with a number of variables. This section provides a broad and descriptive perspective of the writing apprehension construct. The second and third sections respectively examine the construct in light of the written language product and the writing process. The final section provides a brief summary and a rationale for the research.

Research on Writing Apprehension

While writing apprehension research is still in its infancy, a number of studies designed to broaden the theoretical underpinnings of the construct have

emerged. Generally, these studies have attempted to carry writing apprehension research forward by correlating the attitudes students hold toward writing with a number of other variables. In the main, the major sample for these studies have been high school and undergraduate students. To this end, therefore, little is known about the relationship between writing apprehension and elementary students.

Studies examining the effects of anxiety upon school performance and research on oral communication are closely related to, and have provided the impetus for research on writing apprehension. Many studies existing within the field of psychology, for example, have explored the expectation that high anxiety levels negatively affect school performance. These studies have tended to find that there exists a negative correlation between anxiety and school performance (Gaudry and Bradshaw, 1971; McCandles and Castenada, 1956; Palermo, Castenada and McCandles, 1956; Spielberger,1971).

Similar studies have been conducted in the area of oral communication. Within this orientation anxiety is referred to as communication apprehension and is defined by McCroskey (1980) as "...an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or

anticipated (oral) communication with another person or persons." (p.109). Generally, these studies have indicated that high speech apprehension had a negative effect upon school performance. That is , students who feared oral communication generally performed poorly on such school related subjects as writing term papers because they feared communications with their teachers. The low speech apprehensives, on the other hand, frequently approached their teachers to discuss or clarify the writing of a term paper and these students generally performed better than their high speech apprehensive counterparts (Boohar and Seiler, 1984; McCroskey,1977).

Taken together, the above studies have shown that anxiety may affect school performance. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that writing anxiety may affect written communication competence and/or school performance. To this end, research attention is being directed towards broadening the theoretical understandings of the writing apprehension construct.

The emerging body of research on writing apprehension has attempted to examine the relationship between the writing apprehension construct and a number of variables. It has also endeavoured to specify the relationship between writing apprehension and various

school and writing related attitudes, expectations and choices. A seminal study by Daly and Miller (1975) developed a self report instrument, called the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT), which has been used extensively in studies examining the writing apprehension construct. These studies have indicated that writing apprehension is not only measurable but that it is also a relatively independent construct.

In their report Daly and Wilson (1983) summarize thirteen separate investigations of writing apprehension. The thrust of the research focussed on examining the relationship between the construct and measures of self-esteem, personality and subject-specific attitudes. The sample, hundreds of university students in campuses across the United States, completed the WAT and various measures designed to assess the variables under scrutiny. Findings indicated that "... writing apprehension is inversely related to self-esteem, marginally related to some personality measures, inversely associated with math anxiety and positively correlated with oral communication and reading," (p.327).

What is particularly salient about these research findings is the added observation that writing apprehension is a relatively independent construct.

This is largely because no significant correlation was found to exist between the construct and the various personality measures while high correlations were found between writing apprehension and other measures of writing attitudes. To this end, writing apprehension research posits the basic expectation that high apprehension levels may negatively affect disposition toward writing and/or writing performance.

On the subject of sex differences, Daly and Miller (1975) utilized the WAT to identify the writing apprehension levels of college students. Their hypothesis that writing apprehension scores for males would be higher than females was supported. Previous research by Baker (1954) and Martin (1972) have found that females tended to receive higher scores in their compositions than males. To this end Daly and Miller (1975) posited that the presence of positive reinforcement in writing for females would contribute to lower apprehension levels

Prototypical high apprehensive writers have variously been described in the literature as disliking writing, fearing evaluation of their writing and having little confidence in their ability to write (Book, 1976; Faigley, Daly and Witte, 1981; Selfe, 1984). The consequences of these attributes were tested by Daly

and Miller (1975). In a study involving 246 undergraduate students enrolled in basic and remedial writing courses, they formulated the following hypotheses:

> First, high apprehensives would be less willing to enroll in other writing courses than low apprehensive writers. Second, high apprehensives would report significantly less success in previous writing courses than low apprehensives (p.252).

Both hypotheses were validated. For the first hypothesis the authors concluded that writing apprehension affects "... both success expectations and willingness to take other courses."(p.254). For the second hypothesis, the authors suggested that there may be a relationship between the development of writing apprehension and the negative experiences encountered by high writing apprehensives in previous writing courses.

Few studies have investigated the causes of writing apprehension. Daly, (1985), however, cites a study by Harvley-Felder (1978) who used grade ten students as her sample in order to investigate the factors which may contribute to the development of writing apprehension. Following the administration of the WAT, she administered a questionnaire which assessed the potential contributory causes for writing anxiety. The research indicated that "...high apprehensives reported more punishment, less positive reinforcement,and less communication seeking

behaviours than low apprehensives " (p.27).

In summary, the research reviewed here generally tends to support the theoretical expectation that anxiety may affect school performance. It has also described a number of relationships between attitudes toward writing and variables that are directly or indirectly related to writing. One study examined the development of writing apprehension and this study noted some factors which may contribute to the development of writing apprehension. The utility of understanding the writing apprehension construct from the broad perspective delineated here resides in the usefulness of understanding the construct from a framework which incorporates a number of variables not directly related to the written language product and the writing process. The relationship between writing apprehension and the written language product and the writing process will be discussed in subsequent sections of this chapter.

The literature surveyed here has dealt primarily with older students, generally high school and undergraduate students. In addition to describing the individual difference correlates of apprehension, the research has tended to describe high apprehensive writers as avoiding the writing encounter, fearing evaluation of their compositions and having fewer success expectations in writing courses. The extent to which the above findings are present in the

elementary school population has yet to be examined.

Writing Apprehension and the Written Language Product

A concern for the written language product is not the unique province of writing research in general. It has also captured the interest of researchers investigating the writing apprehension construct. These researchers have generally been guided by three approaches. The first approach links writing apprehension to performance on standardized tests. The second and third approaches relate the quantitative indices and qualitative evaluations of the written product to writing apprehension.

Faigley,Daly and Witte (1981) hypothesized that "... high apprehensives would perform differently than low apprehensives on standardized tests of writing related skills." (p.16). Using 110 undergraduate students, they derived levels of apprehension from the scores on the WAT. Eight standardized measures of writing competency were also administered. They found that high apprehensives scored lower on tests of writing-related skills than their low apprehensive counterparts. For all but two standardized tests, the differences were found to be significant. In their discussion, the authors further noted that "... high

apprehensives have less command over matters of usage and written conventions than low apprehensives." (p.19).

In a similar study, Daly and Miller (1975) compared the scores of high and low apprehensive writers on the self-reported section of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). They found a statistically significant, albeit small, correlation between writing apprehension and the self reported scores on the SAT.

In his discussion on the standardized correlates of writing apprehension, Daly (1985) noted that "...one should expect no more than a modest relationship between apprehension and performance (because) the writing apprehension construct ... focusses on a characteristic different from, but related to actual writing behaviours." (p.15). To prevent misinterpretation of the data, he further stated that no causal relationship can be derived from the data. He indicated that "It would be incorrect to draw any conclusion of the sort that writing apprehension "causes" performance deficits or alternatively that performance deficits lead to apprehension." (p.27).

Garcia (1978) questioned whether the syntactic characteristics of written language products would differ for the high and low apprehensive students. The 32 subjects selected for the study ranged in age from 17 to 51 years. After apprehension levels were determined by the WAT, the

students produced a descriptive in-class essay-writing assignment. Seven linguistic measures designed to assess syntactic maturity were used to identify the syntactic characteristics of the composition. Although he found no significant difference between the two groups on the following five syntactic variables:(1) words per T-unit, (2) words per clause, (3) clauses per T-unit, (4) total T-units, and (5) total words, he did find significant differences between the two groups on seven other syntactic variables. These variables included the use of infinitives, participles, gerunds, prepositional phrases, adjective clauses, adverb clauses and noun clauses. On all these measures the low apprehensive group scored significantly higher than their high apprehensive counterparts. In a discussion of his results Garcia (1978) concluded that "... low apprehension students ... demonstrated syntactic characteristics of mature writers more consistently than did high apprehension students" (p.108).

Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) also measured the syntactic development of 110 undergraduate students (55 students were low apprehensive and 55 students were high apprehensive). The subjects were asked to write two essays. One elicited narrative and descriptive writing, while the other elicited argumentative discourse. The essays were evaluated for overall length, several syntactic measures,

including the mean number of words per T-unit, and essay quality.

On overall length, findings indicated that high apprehensives produce significantly shorter essays. The syntactic measures showed that "... high apprehensives put less information into each communication unit." (p.19). The syntactic measures were calculated by the amount of information that was contained in each T-unit or clause. The study confirmed that syntactic complexity was influenced by the particular writing mode. That is, an argumentative mode was found to have greater syntactic complexity than the narrative/descriptive mode for all students in the sample. In other words, the impact of apprehension upon the narrative/descriptive mode was found to be greater than the impact of apprehension upon the argumentative mode. Measures assessing essay quality indicated that writing apprehension has a negative impact upon the evaluations of the personal narrative mode. The argumentative topic, however, indicated that there were no major differences between the two groups in terms of measures used to assess syntactic maturity or the measures used to assess essay quality. The authors suggested that "...high apprehensive writers may have been more anxious about expressing their own feelings, attitudes and experiences than they were about writing on a topic that demanded they argue objectively for a particular point of

view" (p.20).

Book (1976), in a study designed to examine whether or not apprehension affects the structure, language use and amount of information conveyed in the written language products of 40 college students, noted that high apprehensive writers produced three times fewer words as indicated by a simple word count and conveyed four and one-half times less information. Three grammatical patterns, the phrase, the clause and the sentence, were used to assess whether the information conveyed contained a central idea. If the grammatical pattern did convey a central idea it was counted as one unit of information. Book's (1976) findings fit well with the theoretical speculation posited by Faigley, Daly and Witte (1980) that high apprehensives are less willing to disclose their own feelings, attitudes and experiences.

Studies examining the relationship between apprehension and composition quality have generally tended to conclude that high apprehensives are evaluated less positively than low apprehensives (Daly, 1977; Faigley,Daly and Witte, 1981; Garcia, 1978). In one study, Daly (1977) found a significant difference in ratings of message quality between the written language products of undergraduate students who were identified as either high or low apprehensive writers. In this study, message quality was determined by measures of readability and several structural characteristics including

lexical diversity, punctuation counts, words ending in "ly" (these words were thought to indicate the extent to which writers qualify their messages), word counts and statement counts. This research evidence corroborates the findings in other studies completed by Book (1976) and Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981).

In summary, the performance correlates of apprehension indicate that writing anxiety affects standardized test measurements, the quantitative indices of compositions and the qualitative evaluations of written language products. Generally, an inverse relationship between writing apprehension and the various performance correlates was found to exist.

Attention has also been directed to the effects of writing apprehension upon the various modes of written discourse. These studies have indicated that high aprehensive writers do not perform as well in the narrative/descriptive mode because in this type of written discourse writers disclose their own feelings, experiences and attitudes which runs counter to the inclinations of high apprehensive writers. Fewer differences between the two groups were observed with respect to the argumentative writing mode.

In the main, writing apprehension can be seen as a debilitating handicap. This is not surprising in light of

the fact that high apprehensive writers generally score lower on standardized tests of writing related skills, are evaluated less positively and demonstrate less mature syntactic characteristics in their writing than their low apprehensive counterparts. The literature suggests that one factor which may contribute to the low performance of high apprehensive writers lies in their tendency to avoid writing encounters which in turn offers them fewer opportunities for developing their writing skills.

Writing Apprehension and the Writing Process

A major shift in the field of writing research is the current emphasis on the writing process rather than the analysis of the written product. Within this research paradigm, researchers essentially amplify the importance of learning and the writers' cognitive activities during the writing act. The important relationship between understanding the writing process and the teaching of writing has been expressed by many (Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod and Rosen, 1975; Graves, 1983).

Research exploring the writing process has attempted to identify the component dimensions of the writing process (Emig, 1971; Graves, 1975; Nolan, 1978; Pianko, 1979), delineate the features of the revising process (Beach, 1976;

Nold, 1981), identify the writing processes of skilled writers (Stallard, 1975) and unskilled writers (Perl, 1979) and determine how students' perceptions of writing affect the writing process (Cannon, 1981). Few studies have directly examined the effects of writing aprehension upon the writing process.

A seminal study by Emig (1971) used the case study approach to investigate the composing processes of eight grade twelve students considered to be good writers. The students were asked to provide introspective comments while composing. This technique, commonly called the "think aloud" technique, required students to provide overt verbalizations of their covert mental processes while composing. The rationale underlying the use of the "think aloud" technique resides in the belief that insight into inner composing processes will be revealed. Nolan (1978) quoting Emig (1971) states;

> The assumption here is that composing aloud, a writer's effort to externalize his process of composing, somehow reflects, if not parallels, his actual inner process. (p.13).

Subsequent to each composing session, students were also interviewed. These interviews provided the restrospective comment data. Analysis of the data led to the identification of ten dimensions thought to comprise the writing processes of the students who participated in Emig's (1971) study. The

ten major dimensions as delineated by Emig (1971) include: context of composing, nature of stimulus, prewriting, planning, starting, composing aloud: a characterization, reformulation, stopping, contemplation of product and seeming teacher influence. Within each major dimension Emig (1971) also specified a number of smaller components.

Nolan (1978) also attempted to analyze the composing process of good student writers. In his case, however, the sample consisted of grade six students previously identified as good writers. His method included the analysis of both introspective and retrospective comments and this yielded the identification of three major cognitive activities which he labelled Thinking Ahead, Thinking Back and Spontaneous Thinking. Within these major categories, the 43 facets of composing with which the children were concerned and the ten subcategories of these facets were also identified and defined. What is particularly salient about this study is that Nolan (1978) not only identified the numerous dimensions possible in the writing process but that he also recognized the recursive, simultaneous and linear aspects of the process.

In contrast to Emig (1971) and Nolan (1978), Perl (1979) attempted to reveal the composing processes of unskilled writers. Using college students as her sample, she analyzed the student's written products and retrospective and

introspective comments. Her method included the application of a coding instrument to analyze the protocols. She noted that all students exhibited consistent composing processes in that "...the behavioural subsequences (of) prewriting, writing and editing appeared in a sequential pattern that were recognizable across writing sessions and across students"(p.328). She also found that recursive movements occurred frequently and that although the composing process was interrupted frequently by editing behaviours, syntactic and stylistic problems remained.

While some research strands investigating the writing process have focussed upon skilled writers and some have centered concern upon the unskilled writer, other orientations have attempted to compare and contrast the writing processes of remedial and traditional writers. The latter concern was reflected in a study conducted by Pianko (1979).

The 12 traditional and 12 remedial writers selected for the study, all college freshmen, were required to write five essays. One session involved the collection of observation tapes and interview data. Results indicated differences in (1) the amount of composing time, (2) the average essay length, (3) concern for style, audience, purpose and message intent. Comparisons of each variable favored the traditional writer as opposed to the remedial writer. From the data on

the particular concerns of the writer, Pianko (1979) surmised that "... traditional college writers have a more fully developed understanding of what contributes to good writing" (p.14).

Drawing upon previous studies by themselves and others and the informal analysis of many protocols, Hayes and Flower (1980) have created a model which explicates their conception of the writing process. Within their multi-faceted model, they labelled the major process categories, delineated the organization of these categories and explicated the functions of, and the relationships between,the various categories. The three major process categories were labelled planning, translating and reviewing. Subcategories comprising each of the major categories were also identified. Previous research tends to support the notion that the writing process does not always occur in a linear fashion. In fact Pianko (1979) stated that the writing process "... has proven to be multi-faceted, with many of its elements functioning simultaneously, recursively, and/or in a linear fashion." (p.5). To this end, Hayes and Flower (1980) imposed one caveat upon the use of their model. They suggested that although the writing process may indeed at times occur in successive stages, their model should not be considered a stage model but should instead be used in light of the research findings which suggest that the process is also

recursive and simultaneous.

While writing research in general has witnessed an influx of studies examining the writing process, few studies have coupled concern for the writing process to writing apprehension. A few studies, however, have investigated this issue.

In her study involving eight college students, four high and four low apprehensive writers, Selfe (1980) attempted to discern the nature of the predrafting processes present in each group. Four 90 minute writing sessions involved four different data gathering techniques which included timed codings of composing aloud sessions, retrospective and introspective protocols and videotapes of physical behaviours. The major conclusion derived from the study noted that the two groups "...exhibited two very different patterns of predrafting activities" (p.48).

One of the differences which was noted involved the way each of the groups approached the writing task. While the low apprehensive group approached the task with confidence and with high expectations of success, the high apprehensive group did not display confidence in approaching the writing task. Another difference concerned the use of written prefiguring and the length of time spent on local and global planning. Written prefiguring, in this study, involved the overt planning of the writing task by delineating on paper a

variety of concerns related to accomplishing the completion of the writing task. Local planning was concerned with planning the ideas which would be used in the story at a sentence or phrase level, while global planning involved planning the overall structure of the writing task. The study found that low apprehensives spent a greater percentage of their time on written prefiguring and used a variety of means to accomplish this end. The high apprehensive group, however, spent little time on written prefiguring and when they did engage in this behaviour it was generally done in a very limited way. For the local and global planning characteristics of the two groups, it was found that the high apprehensives were more concerned with casting the first sentence of their product than they were in planning the overall structure. This was not found to be true for the low apprehensive group. Generally, this group did plan ahead before they began the actual writing.

Daly (1985) refers to a study conducted in 1981 by Hayes in which he analyzed the retrospective protocols of one low apprehensive student and one high apprehensive student. In comparing the writing process used by each student, he discovered that the high apprehensive writer wrote fewer words per minute, spent less time on actual writing, paused more frequently and completed fewer drafts than the low anxious writer. Although this study suffers from an

extremely limited sample, the degree of fit between these findings and the results reported in similar studies is favorable.

Taken together, these studies have described the multi-faceted and dynamic nature of the writing process. The number of component dimensions in the writing process and the descriptions of these dimensions have frequently varied from one study to the next. Despite this diversity, however, there tended to exist an element of commonality. Studies have generally tended to recognize the simultaneous, recursive and/or linear nature of the process.

Research has also shown that there exists a growing recognition that the writing process may vary depending upon the particular group being examined. The nature of the writing processes employed by good, skilled, unskilled and apprehensive writers, for example, varied. That is, different kinds of writers do not necessarily make use of the same dimensions of the writing process nor do they proceed through the process in identical fashions.

Research linking writing apprehension to the writing process has generally examined the effects of varying degrees of writing apprehension upon the writing process. These studies have tended to substantiate that group differences can be discerned in the way high and low apprehensive writers engage in the writing process.

Summary and Rationale

The overarching purpose of this chapter has been to review the literature pertinent to this study. To this end, related fields of research such as psychology and oral communication which have examined the impact of anxiety upon school performance were briefly presented. These studies have generally concluded that an inverse relationship between anxiety and school performance fits the expectation.

Also presented were a number of relationships between writing apprehension and various school and writing related attitudes, expectations and choices. Results of these studies have indicated that writing apprehension is a relatively independent construct which bears a number of relationships to various individual difference variables.

Studies examining the relationship between writing apprehension and the written language product have indicated that predisposition towards writing affects the quantitative indices, standardized test measurements and the qualitative evaluations of the written language product. These studies, for the most part, tended to confirm that writing apprehension may be a debilitating handicap because generally an inverse relationship between writing apprehension and the various performance correlates was found to exist.

The multi-faceted and dynamic nature of the writing process has also been revealed. The process consists of many components which are used simultaneously, linearly and/or recursively by most writers. The research also showed that high and low apprehensive writers differed not only in the types of process components they used but also in the nature in which they progressed through the process.

While a great deal of research has been reviewed, glaring gaps can be noted. For example, writing apprehension research has focussed almost entirely upon undergraduate and high school students. Since writing apprehension has often been "... conceptualized as a learned response by the individual to the writing encounter (Daly, 1977,p.571)", it is entirely possible that writing apprehension has its origins in the elementary grades. To advance a more comprehensive and meaningful understanding, therefore, it seems requisite that further research be undertaken to examine writing apprehension in the elementary grades.

Chapter III

THE DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Overview

This chapter reports the design and the procedures used in this study. A description of the design of the study is presented followed by a discussion of the selection of subjects, the instruments used, the writing task, the procedures for gathering data and a report on the pilot study.

The Design

The major purpose of this study was to examine the written language products and the writing processes of high apprehensive grade six writers. Low apprehensive grade six writers were also examined in a similar manner and were compared to the high apprehensive writers in order to contrast the written products and the writing processes of the low apprehensive and the high apprehensive writers. To achieve this goal, a revised version of the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT)

was administered to 82 grade six students in three classrooms in one school. Responses to the WAT were scored and the results were listed in descending order from the highest to the lowest scores. Because apprehension is not absolute, students scoring in the top ten percent and students scoring in the bottom ten percent were considered possible candidates for the study. Teacher opinion figured prominently in the selection of the sample because the teachers' perceptions and observations of students' attitudes about writing were taken into consideration. Once the subjects were selected a brief pilot study, using one low and one high apprehensive student not part of the actual study, was undertaken. The students comprising the sample were each familiarized with the videotaping and the nature of "thinking aloud" while writing. Each student was asked to write about a predetermined topic and was requested to comment introspectively while composing. Retrospective data consisting of comments about the writing process were gathered immediately after each composing session.

Tapes of the introspective and retrospective comments were transcribed and the written products were collected. The initial analysis of the introspective protocols led to a coding scheme which was then applied

in a second and third analysis. To assure reliability of the results two raters were asked to code ten percent of the data. Because the retrospective data differed qualitatively from the introspective data, the coding scheme was not applied to the former. Instead, this analysis focussed on the types of writing strategies upon which the students relied while writing their stories.

The stories written by the students were also analyzed for a number of quantitative indices. Moreover, a qualitative evaluation for each piece of writing also took place

Sample Selection

Eight grade six students and their respective teachers participated in this study. Four students, two males and two females, comprised the high apprehensive group. The low apprehensive group consisted of three females and one male.

Subject selection was based upon the following criteria:

A. Students could be placed in either the high apprehensive or low apprehensive group if:

1. their scores on the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) fell within the top or bottom ten percent of the total range of scores, and

2. their teachers' perceptions and observations supported the findings of the WAT.

B. English was to be the students' first language.

C. When compared to their peers, students were to be considered by their teachers as within the average range of achievement.

D. Both the teachers and the students who participated in this study were to be volunteers.

It was felt that coupling the scores on the WAT with the teachers' perceptions of the students' apprehension levels would provide a valid intersect of students who were either low or high apprehensive writers.

Imposing the English as a first language criteria was considered important because the qualitative evaluations of the written language products could be negatively affected if students were unfamiliar with the language. Since the Sager Writing Scale focusses one of its features upon vocabulary, it was thought essential that all students should have English as their first language. This criteria did not pose a

problem since all students initially considered for the study spoke English as their first language.

On the issue of average achievement, some difficulties were encountered. Perceptions as to the meaning of "average" varied. To this end, standards were imposed. The majority of marks for each student on their last report card must have been "C" - in this school system a letter grade of "C" denotes average achievement. The students selected for the study ranged from low average to high average. It was deemed important to impose this criteria because either very high or very low academic ability could have some impact upon the product analysis and/or the process analysis.

An initial meeting with the principal of the school helped the researcher gain his support. All teachers volunteered to participate in this study after a briefing designed to familiarize the teachers with the purposes of the study. The students also volunteered and letters of consent were signed by the parents.

The Instrument

The Writing Apprehension Test

Writing apprehension research is very much dependent upon the proficient and accurate assessment of the writing apprehension construct. This task, however, is the source of much frustration because subjective constructs like apprehension or anxiety are not particularly amenable to measurement (Oller, 1979).

Some studies have attempted to operationalize writing apprehension. The Writing Apprehension Test (WAT), devised by Daly and Miller (1975), is one such measure and has been used extensively and with success in a number of studies.

The purpose of the test is to assess the apprehension levels of writers. It is basically a self-report instrument where respondents are instructed to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with attitude statements concerning writing on a 5 point Likert-type scale, where responses range from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Daly and Miller (1975) report that the reliability and test-retest reliability of the instrument respectively are .940 and

.923. Fagan, Jensen and Cooper (1985) maintain that the instrument has both internal consistency and predictive validity. Examples cited by the authors as illustrating predictive validity include:

(1) ... choice of academic majors and occupations that vary in writing requirements,

(2) ... enrollment in advanced writing courses,

(3) ... quality of writing. (p.172).

A slightly revised version of the WAT was used in this study to determine the writing apprehension levels of all students (82) in one school. Revisions occurred basically to accommodate the language of Grade six students. While the language was altered slightly in ten items, the intent of these items, remained the same. For example, in the original instrument several items refer to the term "composition class". In the WAT administered in the present study the word "writing" was substituted for the word "composition" because these students had greater familiarity with the term "writing class" than "composition class". Before the test was administered, students were advised that "honesty" was important. To familiarize the students with the format of the test, samples such as " I eat spinach whenever I can " were discussed orally. Once the researcher felt assured that students

understood the task, the testing session, which lasted approximately 15 - 20 minutes, began.

A discussion of the scoring procedures and the range of apprehension levels derived from the revised version of the WAT is included in Chapter IV. A copy of the test is included in Appendix A.

The Writing Task

Barnes, Britton and Rosen (1971), in analyzing the different functions of language, have identified three main categories of written language, the transactional, the expressive and the poetic. The underlying purpose of the transactional mode is to impart information. On the other hand, the intent of the expressive and the poetic modes of written discourse is to disclose the feelings and ideas of the writer. Whereas the transactional mode imposes a certain structure upon the writing, the poetic and the expressive modes do not impose a structure or a pattern on the writing.

In this study, the nature of the writing task was designed to allow students free reign as to the structure or patterns they wished to impose upon their

own writing for the following reasons:

(1) Martin, D,Arcy, Newton and Parker (1976) suggest that expressive writing is nearest to speech. Since all students appeared equally capable of expressing themselves orally, it could be quite reasonable to assume that differences found in the product and process analysis were the function of writing apprehension rather than the function of a speech communication handicap.

(2) It was deemed important to allow the students free reign as to the type of structure they wished to impose upon the writing task. Assigning a writing task with a predetermined structure, as is imposed by transactional writing, may have inhibited the writing of some students.

(3) Research seems to indicate that one characteristic common to high apprehensive writers is their unwillingness to disclose their own feelings and ideas in their writing. By assigning a task which in some way demands disclosure, this theory could be put to the test.

(4) It was felt that transactional writing such as "Tell me all you know about the solar system" would test recall of a school learned subject or the intellectual capacity of the student for recalling

facts and writing about them.

The task was also extemperaneous in nature. Students were given a sheet with the assigned topic explained and were then asked to write about the topic. It was felt that a discussion of the topic prior to the writing could result in students including ideas in their writing which may have originated with the researcher. This method assured the researcher that all students were prepared for the writing in a similar manner.

The predetermined topic assigned to all students in the sample is reported below:

"You and your best friend have been chosen to be the first young astronauts to visit a distant planet thought to be inhabited by intelligent creatures. Tell about your adventure"

Data Gathering Procedures

To achieve the purpose of the study and to satisfy the demands of the research question, three main types of data were gathered:

1. Data from the revised WAT was gathered to

supply scores on the apprehension levels of the students who were to participate in this study.

2. The written language product was collected to facilitate a quantitative and qualitative analysis of each piece of writing.

3. Verbal statements reflecting both introspective and retrospective comments were audiotaped and transcribed in order to analyze the writing processes of the students in the sample.

The procedures for gathering the three main types of data are reported below.

1. The Writing Apprehension Scores

The revised version of the WAT was administered to all 82 students in three different grade six classes in one school in a suburban community. The major reason for administering the WAT and deriving apprehension levels of the students was to help facilitate the identification of students who would be suitable subjects for this study.

Only the students and the researcher were in the room at the time of testing. The students were told that the researcher was interested in understanding how children felt about writing. Directions were read and

then discussed with the students. Honesty in responding to each statement was stressed. Several sample questions were recorded on the board and the students as a group were taken through the procedure. Differences in their answers and the reasons for these differences were explored. Subsequent to this procedure, the test was then distributed. The whole procedure lasted approximately 30 to 35 minutes, with the actual testing comprising a 15 to 20 minute time segment. No difficulties were encountered in the administration of the WAT.

2. The Language Product

Following the selection of the sample, all students on an individual basis, wrote about a predetermined topic in an empty classroom of the school. The following conditions for writing existed for each composing session:

(1) A time limitation was not imposed.

(2) Length was not specified.

(3) All students were abundantly supplied with lined paper.

(4) All students sat at a desk that was to their liking.

(5) No assistance was offered or given during the actual writing.

Once the writing session was completed, each story was photocopied and one copy was given to the student. The original copy was kept by the researcher. The students did not object to the researcher retaining the original copy of their stories.

3. The Writing Process

To gather data which would illuminate the nature of the writing process, three main procedures were used. First, each student was videotaped during the composing session. The videotaping occurred on an individual basis. Second, to gather the introspective comments which would provide insight into the writing process, students were asked to "think aloud" during the composing process. Third, students were asked to view the videotape of their composing session and then asked to provide further comments retrospectively about their particular composing process. Each of the procedures used to gather data about the writing process are reported below.

A. Videotaping Procedures

One Panasonic VHS camera positioned on a tripod was angled over the writer's shoulder in order to film the production of the story as it unfolded. A "zoom" lens allowed the researcher to close in on the actual words being written and this technique was used frequently. Because the sound equipment did not effectively record the verbal statements made by the students, comments were also audiotaped with a Sony taperecorder which was fitted with a lapel microphone.

All students were familiarized with the equipment prior to the actual recording and participated in a trial recording to check the equipment.

B. The Introspective Comments

Prior to the actual study all students, on an individual basis, were familiarized with the video equipment and the "think aloud" technique. Patterning Nolan (1978), the researcher provided the following directions for "thinking aloud":

"That little microphone pinned to your clothes will pick up and record anything you say while you are

writing. I will be videotaping and I would like you to talk to yourself as you write. Say all the things that are going through your mind as you plan and write the story. If you do this we will have a picture of you writing and the words that are going through your mind. So, talk to yourself, speak aloud what is going through your mind. After this we will watch a replay of the videatape and we will be able to see and hear how you made up the story." (p.34).

The researcher did not model this technique since the experience gained from the pilot study indicated that students tended to "parrot" the researcher rather than report their own unique thinking and writing processes.

Generally, the students did not encounter difficulties with the "think aloud" technique. Some students, however, were at times reminded to tell what they were thinking. This usually occurred during long pauses where the researcher felt somewhat assured of the fact that the student was thinking about part of the story but was not verbalizing these thoughts.

C. The Retrospective Comments

After the composing phase was completed, the

students were given about a ten minute respite to allow them to relax. During this time, the researcher prepared the materials in order to gather data for the retrospective comments. This involved rewinding the tape, preparing the videorecorder and photocopying the story. Both the researcher and the student had access to the story during this phase of the study. The rationale for this procedure was to accommodate accessibility to the language product, both for the student and the researcher.

The students were given the following directions:

"Now that you have written the story and talked about what was going through your mind, we will watch what happened on the television screen

Feel free to tell me to stop the videorecorder anytime you have comments about what you were thinking while you were writing.

The microphone will record everything you say."

For all the students in the sample the whole tape was replayed because it was considered important to maximize the gathering of retrospective data since this offered additional glimpses into what the students were thinking during the composing phase.

Unlike Nolan (1978), who found that students "... responded readily to the stimulus of a videotape

recording of their writing to discuss their composing process" (p.35), this researcher found otherwise. For the most part, students did not initiate further comments either by requesting specific segments of the tape or by initiating requests to stop the tape in order to supply additional data about the writing process. This was also found to be true for the students who participated in the pilot study.

Because the students experienced some difficulty in initiating further comments, much of the retrospective data resulted from researcher initiated questions about the process. The questions developed largely on a spontaneous basis and were very much dependent upon the unique statements and behaviours exhibited by students as they wrote their stories.

The comments gathered during this phase were later transcribed. It was found that the introspective and retrospective comments differed. For the introspective comments the students responded spontaneously as they engaged in the writing process. Their comments largely reflected what they were thinking while writing. The retrospective comments, on the other hand, were prompted responses to researcher initiated questions about the writing process. Neither the questions nor the responses may accurately have reflected the

students' thinking while writing and to this end qualitative differences between the two types of verbal statements were found to exist.

The Pilot Study

A pilot was conducted in the same school where the actual research occurred. One high apprehensive and one low apprehensive student, not part of the actual study, participated.

The purpose of the pilot study was to achieve the following objectives:

1. to test the credibility of the self-report instrument as a means for identifying the low and high apprehensive writer,

2. to familiarize the researcher with the videotaping techniques and procedures,

3. to test the suitability of the writing task,

4. to establish a time-frame for the study,

5. to examine the extent to which grade six students were able to provide introspective comments while composing and retrospective comments while reviewing a videotape of their writing, and

6. to allow for further direction and/or

modification with respect to the research design itself.

1.Procedures

Each student was seen individually by the researcher in an empty classroom within the school. The student was told that the researcher was interested in discovering how children wrote stories. Each student was familiarized with the videotaping and audiotaping procedures. The "think aloud" technique was explained and modelled. The purpose of reviewing the tapes and the need for commenting about the writing process retrospectively was also explained. The task, to write about the space adventure, was discussed before the actual writing.

One Panasonic VHS camera was used to videotape each student. The camera was angled over the student's shoulder in order to film the story as it unfolded. During this phase students were required to comment introspectively. After the writing was completed, the students reviewed the tape and were asked to provide further comments about the writing process. The introspective comments from the videotape and retrospective comments from the audiotape were both

transcribed.

2. Results

The objectives of the pilot study were examined and the following conclusions resulted.

1. The self-report instrument was deemed to be an adequate tool for identifying the writing apprehension levels of students. Scores ranging from 127 to 38 indicated that writing apprehension varied across the students. The teachers' perceptions and observations of students who were possible high and low apprehensive candidates supported the findings of the WAT. Moreover, research studies have shown that differences exist between the written language products and the writing processes of high and low apprehensive writers and the students participating in the pilot displayed many of these differences.

2. Several camera angles were tested by the researcher and the most suitable position was found to be one where the direction of the camera focussed upon the written product. Hence, an "over-the-shoulder" camera angle was deemed the most suitable.

3. The pilot sample did not experience any undue difficulty with the assigned task or in understanding

the purpose of the task. However, some difficulties were noted with respect to the discussion before the actual writing. Students seemed to pattern their stories after the discussion and included the ideas presented by the researcher. Since the planning phase of the writing process focusses upon the generation of ideas by the writer, it was felt that the pre-discussion should be deleted from the actual study.

4. For the most part, it appeared that either a whole morning or a whole afternoon would be required in order to complete the composing phase and the reviewing phase of this study. To this end, permission for release time for each student was sought from, and granted by, the teachers.

5. The students did not appear to experience any difficulties commenting while composing. Self-initiated retrospective comments occurred infrequently and the researcher posed many questions to gain further insight into the student's composing processes.

6. It was found that transcribing the introspective comments from the videotape was an extremely laborious task and that the camera angle did not effectively record comments. To this end, all student talk was audiotaped on a transistorized Sony

taperecorder to facilitate an easier transcription process.

Summary

This study was designed to examine the written language products and the writing processes of high and low apprehensive grade six writers. Scores from a revised version of the Writing Apprehension Test, coupled with teachers' perceptions of students writing apprehension levels helped select the sample. Students were asked to write about a predetermined topic, were videotaped and audiotaped during the writing and were required to comment introspectively as they wrote. The introspective comment data provided insight into the writing process. After the writing, students reviewed the videotape of their writing and were audiotaped as they commented retrospectively about the writing process. Retrospective comments resulted largely from researcher initiated questions. A brief pilot study set the stage for the actual research project.

The central focus of this chapter has primarily concentrated upon the research design. The next chapter, Chapter IV, will discuss the method of analysis.

Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Overview

Three main types of data were gathered for this study - scores from the revised WAT, the written language product and verbal statements or comments which were obtained both introspectively and retrospectively. The methods used to analyze the data are discussed below.

The Writing Apprehension Test-Revised

The revised version of the WAT, like the original version, consisted of 26 statements. Each statement in the revised WAT maintained the meaning and intent of the original statement. Not all statements were altered, only those where the language was considered inappropriate for a grade six student.

Scoring the WAT was undertaken in accordance with

the formula provided by Daly and Miller (1975):

"Writing Apprehension = 78 - Positive Scores + Negative Scores." (p.246).

Daly and Miller (1975) assigned either a positive or negative value to each statement in the self-report instrument. Item I, "I avoid writing", for example, was considered "positive". The purpose of the test, is to measure apprehension and to this end all statements that indicate a negative attitude toward writing are given a positive score. Of the 26 items in the test, one-half are given positive values and the remaining half are assigned negative values.

The utility of using the revised WAT resides in its usefulness for facilitating the identification of writing apprehension levels among a group of students. Since, apprehension is not absolute, it was decided that students in the top ten percent of the range of scores would be considered possible candidates for selection in the high apprehensive group. Conversely, students in the bottom ten percent were categorized as low apprehensives in a similar manner to the procedures used by Selfe (1984).

The Written Language Product

Examination of a number of variables comprised the

quantitative analysis of the written language product. These included number of words, number of T-units, number of words per T-unit and average number of words per T-unit.

A simple word count achieved the first objective. For the second objective, each sample was divided into T-units, herein defined as any independent clause with all its modifiers in order to obtain a standard unit which would avoid run-on sentences. In addition, the average number of words per T-unit was computed.

The Sager Writing Scale was used to derive the qualitative measures of each writing sample. This evaluation scheme uses a rating scale which ranges from zero to three. The specific features upon which this scale focusses are vocabulary, organization, elaboration and structure. Each of the four features are defined and criteria for scoring are explained. In this scale each feature is rated on a four point scale. Hence, the possible total for each feature is 3 points and the possible total for each writing sample, when evaluated by one rater is 12 points. A copy of the Sager Writing Scale is included in Appendix B.

Besides the researcher, two raters were also asked to provide a qualitative analysis of the products using the Sager Writing Scale. The raters evaluated the writing samples independently and the scores they assigned each feature were added. For one written language product, for

example, the three raters assigned values of 2,2 and 3 to the feature which focussed upon vocabulary. The total vocabulary score for this writing sample is 7 points out of a possible total of 12 points.

With the three raters, therefore, the total possible score for each feature is 12 points, the total possible score for each writing sample is 36 points and the total possible score for each of the groups is 144 points. The scores for each feature, writing sample and group provided insight as to the qualitative nature of the language products.

The Writing Process

Both the introspective and the retrospective comments provided by the subjects were used as a means for gaining insight into the covert mental activities of the students while composing. The utility of composing aloud and commenting retrospectively in order to derive some understanding of the cognitive processes while writing has been demonstrated by many researchers (Emig, 1971; Nolan, 1978; Perl, 1979; Stallard, 1974).

In this study, both introspective and retrospective comments were used to gain an understanding of the writing processes of high and low apprehensive students. The analysis of the introspective comments and retrospective

comments are dealt with separately in this chapter largely because the comments differ qualitatively from each other. The introspective comments were all student initiated and the coding scheme derived from these statements revealed components of the writing process. The retrospective comments, on the other hand, were for the most part, responses to researcher questions and were segmented according to ideational units and analyzed in terms of the writing strategies upon which the children relied while composing.

A. Introspective Comments

While commenting introspectively students were asked to verbalize everything that they thought as they composed. Their verbalizations were audiotaped and transcribed. All transcriptions were typed on 8 1/2" - 11" paper where the comments appeared on the left half of the page and the right half was reserved for the actual analysis of the data.

The initial examination of the verbal statements resulted in the identification of a number of discrete components which appeared to constitute the writing process. The components, defined here as "stages of writing behaviour during the composing of a written language product" were listed tentatively and then examined for elements of

commonality.

To facilitate the production of a coding scheme, the researcher parallelled the work of Nolan (1978) by following his systematic approach to data analysis. Essentially, the procedure used for the analysis of the introspective comments involved three related but distinct stages.

The first phase involved the syntactic segmentation of the comments into statements which Nolan (1978) defines as "... segment(s) of a subject's introspective ... comments consisting of an independent clause and its modifiers." (p.48). Below is an example of how the syntactic segmentation occurred. The slashes separate one syntactic unit from another.

> "/What would I call the creatures there?/ Would it be creatures or aliens or things?/ I think it will be creatures./

The second phase involved the identification and labelling of the statements which resulted from the segmentation process. The statements about the writing process which resulted from the segmentation of the language in the above sample, for example, were labelled in the following manner. The first statement, "What would I call the creatures there?", was labelled as Generating/Naming because in this statement the student exhibits concern for naming the characters in the story. In the second statement

the student generated a number of lexical choices with respect to the possible names she could attach to her characters and to this end, therefore, this statement was labelled Generating/Lexical Choices. In the third statement the student has decided upon a name for her character and her decision-making behaviour was labelled Selecting because the student accepted rather than rejected an idea that was previously generated. In labelling the statements the researcher always considered the larger context within which the statements occurred.

In the third phase, the statements were examined for common elements in order to facilitate the identification of the main categories and sub-categories. In the example above the student verbalized a statement about the writing process which demonstrates concern for a decision-making behaviour. This statement and others such as "probably dismal", "no, that would be boring" and "I think I'll take exclaimed" were grouped together because these statements reflected decision-making on the part of the student while writing. Phases two and three were repeated a number of times and to this end occurred recursively until the categories reflected the data and were inclusive of all introspective comments. This three-step procedure was found to be an effective method for developing the coding scheme and classifying the introspective verbal statements of the subjects.

Phase 1 - Segmenting the Language

The syntactic segmentation of the language according to Nolan (1978) "... provided an objective means of reducing the language to small units which could then be examined for their semantic intent." (p.48). Hence, the overriding purpose of segmenting the language was to facilitate a semantic analysis rather than a syntactic analysis.

The meaning of the statements resulting from the segmentation process were always examined in light of the context within which it existed. To this end, even incomplete statements and single words could be analyzed and classified for their semantic intent.

Drawing upon the work of Nolan (1978), the following procedures were observed in segmenting the introspective comments.

First, very little language was excluded from the analysis. Single words and incomplete statements, for the most part, were included because the researcher was able to discern the semantic meanings of these units based upon their contextual position within the transcript.

Second, the language that was excluded from the analysis included comments such as "you know, like, sort of". Statements such as "that sure is a noisy bunch over there" or

"that is the recess bell" were also excluded from the data analysis. Statements such as those described above were considered irrelevant because they did not concern the writing process.

Phase 2 - Labelling the Statements

The segmentation process resulted in numerous statements. These statements were subsequently classified and definitions generated for categories of similar items. The tentative list of process components which resulted from the previous analyses of the data served as a basis for labelling the statements. Once the statements were labelled, commonalities between groups of statements were discerned and categorized. The two following statements, "I was thinking of all the titles I could write down now" and "I've got to think of a title for my story", for example, were labelled as "naming" because of the writers' concern in the writing process for conceiving a name for the story.

While Nolan (1978) refers to the term "component" as "element" and defines it as "... a particular concern or stage in the overall composition of a story." (p.52), the commonalities between these two terms resides in their concern for the identification of discrete behaviours which constitute the writing process.

The definitions were generated from common clusters of statements. In defining the components of the writing process, the researcher relied heavily upon the nature of the statements supplied by the children. The definition for naming, for example, reflected the concerns of the writers for conceiving ideas which would name the story.

Phase 3 - Creating the Main and Sub-categories

The discrete components of the writing process, once identified and classified, were arranged into seven main categories and twelve sub-categories.

Specific relationships among the various components were identified and labelled. A number of components, for example, focussed upon the writers' attempt to conceive ideas for the stories. These components were sub-categorized as "generating behaviours" and included concern for conceiving ideas to name the characters and/or the story, ideas to advance the plot development, ideas to generate the setting and so on.

Relationships among the sub-categories were also identified and labelled in order to derive the main categories. For example, the sub-categories rereading, considering form and considering content were grouped into a main category labelled "Editing and Revising Behaviours"

because the relationship among the three sub-categories reflected concern for editing and/or revising errors.

The main category "Miscellaneous Behaviours" was specifically designed to accommodate the sub-categories which did not adequately suit the definitions of the remaining categories. The "Miscellaneous Behaviour" category also allowed for a degree of flexibility.

Definitions of Components in the Writing Process

The analyses of the introspective comments resulted in the identification of a number of components which constituted the writing processes of the children participating in this study. Each process component was subsequently defined as simply and accurately as possible and protocol examples were provided in order to illustrate and clarify each definition. The coding scheme with definitions appears below.

A. Planning Behaviours: the process of generating the ideas for both content and form for possible inclusion in the story.

1. Generating: the conceiving of ideas which may

be included in the written story.

1.1. Beginning: the generation of ideas to commence writing the story.

Kerri: I might start it by saying what happened on the first day when we were in the rocket or how to start when we're on the launching pad to get ready to go up into space.

1.2. Ending: the generation of ideas which will conclude the writing of the story.

Kerri: How will I end it, like maybe she went back there some other time or they have fun.

1.3. Setting: the generation of ideas which will articulate time references and/or places within the story.

Sandy: What the planet is going to look like when they find it.

1.4. Plot Development: the generation of ideas and details which will describe and advance the sequence of events in the story.

Jody: What will we do on this planet when we reach there?

1.5. Naming: the generation of ideas for identifying the title of the story, identifying story characters and/or places within the story.

Christa: I was thinking of the titles that I could write down now.

1.6. Lexical Items: the generation of

specific words which will adequately convey the writer's thoughts and intentions

Alana: Should I put cave or cavern or a house or a thing I've never seen before?

1.7. Characterizations: the generation of ideas which will illustrate character feelings and moods, character activities, character dialogue and/or character descriptions.

Christa: I'm thinking of how they feel when they went on to the ship.

1.8 Generating/Non-Specific: the generation of ideas which are not specifically delineated in items 1.1 to 1.7.

Kerri: I'm thinking of what I can write next

B. Translating Behaviours: the process of rendering the selected ideas from thought to oral language in preparation for the actual writing.

2.0 Rehearsing: the translating of ideas to oral language which approximates the written text.

2.1 Rehearsing Without Elaboration: the rehearsal of selected ideas with the ideas appearing verbatim in the written text.

Language protocol: Yes, we'll go.

Text Protocol: Yes, we'll go.

(Christa)

2.2 Rehearsing With Elaboration: the rehearsal of selected ideas with additional ideas appearing in the written text.

Language Protocol: What the people are going to look like.

Text Protocol: The people are going to look almost like us.

(Barry)

2.3 Rehearsing With Truncation: the rehearsal of selected ideas with one or more ideas deleted in the written text.

Language Protocol: all of a sudden he got fried to death by electricity or something coming out of his arm.

Text Protocol: He got fried to death.

(Merron)

C. Evaluation Behaviours: the process of appraising the writing

3.0. Assessing: the evaluation of the written text with respect to the form and/or content or appraises his or her own writing or his or her enjoyment of writing.

3.1. Assessing Own Writing: the evaluation, either positively or negatively, of the written product and/or the enjoyment of writing.

Christine: I'm not very good at writing.

3.2. Assessing Form and/or Content: the evaluation, either positively or negatively, of the form, mechanics, lexical items or ideas in the written text.

Kerri: I think that is pretty good.

D. Editing and Revising Behaviours: the checking and altering of the form and/or content in the written story.

4.0 Rereading: the checking of the written text for both content and/or form.

4.1. Rereading for Content: the checking of the written text for lexical items and ideas

Carla: I'm just going to proofread the sentence to make sure it makes sense.

4.2. Rereading for Form: the checking of the written text for the form and the mechanics.

Carla: I just read them over and make sure they're spelled right and they don't sound funny

4.3. Rereading / Non-specific: the checking of the written text without indicating a particular reason for the act.

Sandy: I'm rereading.

5.0. Considering Form: the editing and/or

revising of both the content and the mechanics of the written text.

5.1. Spelling: the editing and/or revising of the words in the story according to accepted usage.

Alana: I spelled that wrong.

5.2. Punctuation/Capitalization: the editing and/or revising of the punctuation and/or capitaliization in the story according to accepted usage.

Christa: Then I have put it in quotes

5.3. Grammar: the editing and/or revising of parts in the written text according to the accepted rules of the English language.

Carla: I'm gonna add I wanted to be not I wanted to.

5.4. Organization: the editing and/or revising of the structure of the written text. This could include the arrangement of paragraphs, sentences, phrases or words.

Carla: I'm trying to think whether or not I should be putting that after say here.

6.0. Considering Content: the editing and/or revising of lexical items and/or ideas contained in the written text.

6.1. Lexical Choice : the editing and/or revising of lexical items used in the written text.

Carla: I'm going to change Mom to Mother.

6.2. Shaping Meaning: the editing and/or revising of the ideas contained in the written story.

Carla: No I'm going to change that completely, I'm going to say they began their trip.

E. Writing Strategy Behaviours: the methods and/or devices upon which the writer relies in the production of the written text.

7.0. Generating Strategies: the strategies used by the writer to conceive ideas.

7.1. Generating While Writing: a strategy used to generate ideas while physically involved in the writing act.

Christa: While I'm writing this down, I'm thinking of what else I can put in the story.

7.2. Rereading to Generate: a strategy used by the writer which involves checking the written text to develop new ideas based upon what has already been written.

Sandy: Usually, I just skim read over it and by rereading it brings new ideas and more ideas into my head.

7.3. Sources for Generating: a strategy used by the writer for generating new ideas which reflects the use of background knowledge and/or experiences.

Merron: They wouldn't look anything like they would in a book at all.

F. Decision Making Behaviours: the process of choosing the ideas which will or will not appear in the written text.

8.0. Deciding: the writer's confirmation of whether an idea will or will not be used in the story.

8.1. Selecting: the decision to choose a particular idea for inclusion in the story.

Kerri: I think that we'll probably be excited.

8.2. Rejecting: the decision to discard ideas which had previously been generated.

Carla: I was thinking of putting that they gave up a pretty good fight but that wouldn't make any sense.

F. Miscellaneous Behaviours: are additional components of the writing process whose occurence is either too limited to warrant the delineation of a whole new category or whose essence does not adequately fit the definitions previously

established.

9.0. Reviewing: the oral recapitulation but not the actual reading of the written text.

Sandy: O.K., they've walked into the forest but they've found nothing.

10.0. Ambivalence: the expression of uncertainty felt by the writer either about the form or content of the story and/or the process of writing.

Carla: I'm not really sure what to put next.

11.0. Production Concern: the expression of concern about the production of a particular piece.

Kerri: Now, how will I phrase that?

12.0. Non-Specific: the comments which do not adequately fit the major categories or the components in the miscellaneous category.

B. The Retrospective Comments:

The retrospective comments were segmented according to ideational units. Hence, syntactic criteria were not imposed. Rather, the segmenting of the language into ideational units, in this study, involved separating the language into units which expressed one complete thought or

idea related to the writing process. To this end, statements not related specifically to the writing process were deleted from the data because they provided no further insight into the cognitive aspects of the writing process.

Once the language was segmented into units, they were identified and labelled. The labelling did not involve the coding scheme used for the categorizing of the introspective statements. Two reasons accounted for this decision. First, students did not initiate retrospective information. Instead, they relied solely upon researcher initiated questions to provide further insight into their writing processes. Since questions, to a large extent, place parameters upon the responses, the comments may not have been a true reflection of cognitive activities as delineated and defined in the coding scheme used for analyzing introspective data. Secondly, even if the coding scheme was used, analysis of the data for comparing group results would not have been impartial because the researcher did not pose the same questions to each subject and to this end frequency counts would have been affected.

Nevertheless, all transcripts were segmented and labelled according to the "ideas" about writing which appeared to be present in each unit. Comments provided retrospectively resulted in the identification of a number of strategies upon which the students relied while writing.

These strategies resulted in a category labelled " Strategies for Writing" and reflected the "how" of writing. While commenting introspectively, the students also verbalized a number of statements which reflected the "how" of writing but these were not as detailed in their explanations as the comments which were provided retrospectively. Even though all the transcripts were analyzed, only the data gathered from two students were reported in the study and this was largely to accommodate the descriptive profiles of one high apprehensive student and one low apprehensive student.

Summary

The central purpose of this chapter was to report the methods used to analyze the data gathered from the WAT, the written language product and the writing process.

The scoring procedures for the WAT were delineated and its role in the selection of the sample was explained.

The stories were analyzed for quantitative and qualitative variables. Procedures for determining number of words, number of T-units and number of words per T-unit were reviewed . Again, the T-unit as used in this study included any independent clause with all its modifiers. Qualitative

evaluations of the stories involved the use of the Sager Writing Scale. The specific features upon which this evaluation model focusses and the rating scale which it uses were presented and explained.

Data related to the writing process involved a specific focus upon the introspective and retrospective comments made by the students. A method for deriving a coding scheme which was used in analyzing the introspective comments was illustrated. This chapter also includes the coding scheme. The procedures for analyzing the introspective and retrospective comments differed. These differences were explained.

Chapter V presents the results of the study together with a discussion of these results.

Chapter V

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Overview

This chapter contains a report of the findings of this study in terms of the research questions noted in Chapter I. Supplementing the answers to the individual research questions is a descriptive analysis which profiles one high and one low apprehensive writer.

This chapter is organized into four sections. The first and second sections respectively deal with the written product and the writing process. The third section provides the findings related to the relationship between the writing processes and the written products of the two groups. The fourth section will present the profiles of two students. A discussion follows the presentation of results in each section.

The Written Language Product

This section addresses three major research

questions and presents the findings of each question.

Research Question 1

What is the nature of the written products produced by high apprehensive writers?

Table 1 shows three quantitative indices used to analyze the written poducts of the high apprehensive writers in the sample. Total story length ranged from 162 words to 303 words with the average story containing 243 words. The total number of T-units ranged from 24 to 42 with the average being 32. The average number of words per T-unit ranged from 5 to 9 with the average being 7. Table 2 shows the scores for the qualitative analysis of the written language product. The four features upon which the analysis focussed are vocabulary, organization, elaboration and structure with a total possible score of 12 in each category. Since three raters evaluated the written products and because the scores of these raters were combined, the total possible score of each feature in the present study was 36 rather than 12. The total scores for the four features ranged from 8 to 15. When each feature is analyzed, the scores in descending

Table 1

Quantitative Analysis of the Written Products--High Apprehensive Writers

Student	Total No. of words	Total No. of T-Units	Average No. of words per T-Unit
Cynthia	162	30	5
Jason	291	42	6
Amber	219	24	9
Brent	303	34	8

Table 2

Qualitative Analysis of the Written Products--High Apprehensive Writers

Student	Vocabulary	Organization	Elaboration	Structure	Total
Cynthia	1	3	2	2	8
Jason	2	3	4	2	11
Amber	2	4	4	5	15
Brent	3	3	2	2	10

order are 13 for organization, 12 for elaboration, 11 for structure and 8 for vocabulary.

Research Question 2

What is the nature of the written products produced by low apprehensive writers?

Tables 3 and 4 respectively parallel Tables 1 and 2 of the previous section but focus attention upon the low apprehensive group.

For the low apprehensive group, story length ranged from 299 to 1068 words per story with a group average of 581 words. The total number of T-units ranged from 31 to 108 per story. The group average is 56 T-units per story with the average number of words per T-unit being 10 words.

The qualitative analysis of the written product focussed upon four features, vocabulary, organization, elaboration and structure. The total range of scores, out of a possible of 36, varied from 19 to 34. Scores for features focussing upon organization and elaboration each totalled 28. Scores for vocabulary and structure respectively are 26 and 25.

Table 3

Quantitative Analysis of the Written Products--Low Apprehensive Writers

Student	Total No. of words	Total No. of T-Units	Average No. of words per T-Unit
Karen	299	33	9
Sue	1068	108	9
Mike	356	31	11
Colleen	604	54	11

Table 4

Qualitative Analysis of the Written Products--Low Apprehensive Writers

Student	Vocabulary	Organization	Elaboration	Structure	Total
Karen	7	8	7	7	29
Sue	8	9	9	8	34
Mike	7	7	7	4	25
Colleen	4	4	5	6	19

Research Question 3

How are the written products of the two groups similar and/or different?

Tables 5 and 6 respectively show the group comparisons for the quantitative and qualitative analysis. The findings are reported below.

While the total number of words per story for the high apprehensive group ranged from 162 to 303 words per story, the number of words per story for the low apprehensive group ranged from 299 to 1068. For the high and low apprehensive groups the average number of words per story respectively is 243 and 581. Hence, writers in the low apprehensive group tended to write stories that were more than twice as long as those produced by their high apprehensive counterparts. Similar findings were found to be true when the two groups were compared for average number of T-units per story and average number of words per T-unit. For these two measures the low apprehensive group consistently scored higher.

The low apprehensive group when compared to their high apprehensive counterparts consistently scored at least twice as high on all qualitative measures

Table 5

Quantitative Analysis of the Written Products—High and Low Apprehensive Groups

Quantitative Measure	High Apprehensives	Low Apprehensives
Average no. of words per story	243	581
Average no. of T-units per story	32	56
Average no. of words per T-unit	7	10

Table 6

Qualitative Analysis of the Written Products—High and Low Apprehensive Groups

Feature	Total Scores for High Apprehensives	Total Scores for Low Apprehensives
Vocabulary	8	26
Organization	13	28
Elaboration	12	28
Structure	11	25
Total	44	107

evaluating the written language products. Out of a possible total of 144 points, the low apprehensive group scored 107 points and the high apprehensive group scored 44 points. For measures featuring organization, elaboration and structure, the low apprehensive group scored twice as many points, while scoring three times as many points for the vocabulary measure when compared to the scores received by the high apprehensive group.

Discussion

Comparing the written language products of the two groups revealed two major differences. First, the high apprehensives wrote shorter stories containing fewer T-units of shorter duration. Secondly, high apprehensive writers were consistently evaluated less positively than low apprehensive writers on all features examined.

On the subject of story length, the findings of the present study is supported in other research studies. Book (1976) found that high apprehensives produced three times fewer words than low apprehensive students. A study by Daly (1977) also found that high apprehensives wrote significantly fewer words. One factor which may account for story length differences

is the tendency of high apprehensives to avoid the writing encounter. Hence, when confronted with a situation requiring writing, these students may truncate the writing process, causing them to hurry and to generate abbreviated stories.

The present study found that the average number of T-units per story for the high apprehensives was less than half that of their low apprehensive counterparts. Studies by Book (1976) and Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) report similar findings.

The study also found that high apprehensive writers included fewer words per T-unit. Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) found that "...high apprehensives wrote T-units and clauses with significantly fewer words than their low apprehensive counterparts." (p.20). The authors of the foregoing study found this to be particularly true for narrative/descriptive writing as opposed to argumentative writing.

While Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) found that differences in the number of words per T-unit existed between the two groups, Garcia (1977) found otherwise. In his study he concluded that there were no significant differences between the number of words per T-unit in comparing the two groups. The above mentioned studies both examined the written language

products of apprehensive writers at the undergraduate level. The present study focussed upon Grade six students and found that low apprehensive writers tended to include three more words per T-unit when compared to their high apprehensive counterparts. What may account for the difference is the tendency of low apprehensive writers to lengthen T-units by including more dependent clauses in their writing.

The present study found that the overall quality of the stories produced by low apprehensive students was evaluated more positively than the stories produced by high apprehensive students. Research evidence by Book (1976), Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) and Garcia (1978) corroborates the findings of the present study.

The low apprehensive group scored three times as many points for vocabulary as did the high apprehensive group. This evaluative feature focusses upon the writer's ability to articulate thoughts and ideas using both precision and variety in word choice. The low apprehensive group attended to precise vocabulary by naming objects, characters and places within the story. They used vivid expressions such as "the rocket roared to life" and generated a variety of lexical choices to convey an intended meaning. In writing dialogue, for example, they used many more exact words such as

"questioned", "snapped" and "replied" when compared to words such as "said" which were characteristic of the dialogue in the stories produced by high apprehensive writers.

Loban (1963) in examining the language of elementary school children found that students high in language proficiency used a "...greater variety and exactness of vocabulary." (p.41). To this end, students in the low apprehensive group, like students high in language proficiency, appear to be more capable of generating and manipulating language than students in the high apprehensive group.

The three features, organization, elaboration and structure respectively focus upon the ability to arrange ideas in logical order, to generate a number of ideas which flow smoothly from one idea to the next and to use language forms which convey meaning. For all three features, the high apprehensive group was rated less positively than the low apprehensive group. Squire (1965) stated that research has indicated "... that the ability to organize is an important variable in distinguishing between good and poor writers." (p.23). To this end, students in the low apprehensive group tend to reflect the writing characteristics of good writers moreso than students in the high

apprehensive group.

The Writing Process

The three major research questions which this section addresses focus upon the relationship between writing apprehension and the writing process. The questions together with the findings are reported below.

Research Question 4

What is the nature of the writing process employed by high apprehensive writers?

Table 7 presents the major process categories as delineated in the coding scheme included in Chapter IV and shows the number and percentages of statements in each category. Table 8 provides the number and percentages of statements of process components within each major category. These components reflect the minor process categories. Both Tables 7 and 8 focus upon the high apprehensive writer.

Table 7 presents the classification of statements according to the major process categories. The high

Table 7

Classification of Statements According to the Major Process Categories--High Apprehensive Group

Process Categories	Number of Statements	Percentage
A. Planning	87	43%
B. Translating	63	32%
C. Evaluation	2	1%
D. Editing/Revising	10	5%
E. Writing Strategies	2	1%
F. Decision Making	16	8%
G. Miscellaneous	16	8%

Table 8

Classification of Statements According to the Minor Process Categories—High Apprehensive Group

Category	Components		Statements	Percentage
Planning	1.1	Beginning	5	6%
	1.2	Ending	2	2%
(Total = 87 or 43%)	1.3	Setting	13	15%
	1.4	Plot	38	44%
	1.5	Naming	3	3%
	1.6	Lexicon	3	3%
	1.7	Character	10	11%
	1.8	Non-Specific	13	15%
Translating	2.1	with elaboration	21	33%
	2.2	without elaboration	25	40%
(Total = 63 or 32%)	2.3	truncation	17	27%
Evaluating	3.1	own writing	1	50%
(Total = 2 or 1%)	3.2	formal content	1	50%
Edit/Revising	4.1	rdg/content	1	10%
	4.2	rdg/form	0	
(Total = 10 or 5%)	4.3	rdg/non-specific	1	10%
	5.1	spelling	6	60%
	5.2	punct/capit.	1	10%
	5.3	grammar	0	0%
	5.4	organization	1	10
	6.1	lexicon	0	0%
	6.2	meaning	0	0%
Writing Strategies	7.1	writing/generate	2	100%
	7.2	rdg/generate	0	0%
(Total = 2 or 1%)	7.3	sources/generate	0	0%

Table 8, continued

Classification of Statements According to the Minor Process Categories—High Apprehensive Group

Category	Components		Statements	Percentage
Decision-Making	8.1	selecting	11	69%
	8.2	rejecting	5	31%
(Total = 16 or 8%)				
Miscellaneous	9.0	reviewing	2	13%
	10.0	ambivalence	10	63%
(Total = 16 or 8%)	11.0	production	0	0%
	12.0	non-specific	4	24%

apprehensive group verbalized 196 discrete statements which offered insight into the nature of the writing process. The most frequent classification of statements reflected concern for the major category labbelled "Planning". Within this category students exhibit concern for the ideas which could be used in the story.

Next to the Planning Category, the major process category employed most frequently by this group involved the Translating Category (32%). Within this category students orally rehearsed their ideas before writing about them. The classification of statements according to the major process caegories indicated that high apprehensive students employed the Planning and Translating Categories most frequently and that these two categories comprised 75% of the statements verbalized about the writing process. Hence, the statements about the writing process reveal that high apprehensive students are concerned about generating ideas which could be used in their stories and that they frequently transform these ideas into oral language before committing them to paper.

While the Planning and Transforming categories were employed most frequently, the remaining major process categories were used much less frequently. The

evaluation behaviours were seldom used (1%), indicating that these students rarely appraised their own writing. Students seldom verbalized statements which provided insight into the type of writing strategies they employed (1%). Their verbal statements indicated that they edited and/or revised infrequently (5%). The remaining categories which reflected "Decision-making" and "Miscellaneous" behaviours each comprised 8% of the statements about the writing process.

A number of components or minor process categories comprised each major process category. Table 8 provides the number and percentage of statements of the minor process categories.

Within the Planning category, high apprehensive students were most concerned about generating ideas to advance the plot of the story. The minor process category, plot development, comprised 44% of the statements within the Planning category. The component concerned with articulating time references and places within the story together with the Generating/Non-specific component were the next highest in terms of frequency and the distribution for both these minor process categories were 13 or 15% of the statements. Statements about the writing process indicated that students were least concerned with

generating ideas to end the story (2%).

Within the Translating category, the students as a group did not particularly favor one translating component over another. Percentages for rehearsing without elaboration, with elaboration and with truncation respectively were 33%, 40 % and 27%.

While the group profile demonstrates a disposition for employing the Translating category, it was observed that this was largely the result of two male students who displayed a propensity for using this category. Brent generated a total number of 25 statements about his writing process and 22 or 88% of these statements fell within the Translating category. Similarly, Jason generated 23 statements and 11 or 48% of these statements were characteristic of the behaviours in the Translating category. The two females, on the other hand, tended to employ this major category much less frequently preferring instead to use the full range of process categories.

In general the evaluation category was seldom used. Only one student, Cynthia, demonstrated any regard for evaluating the writing. On two occasions she appraised her ability to write and the contents of the written story. Both evaluations were appraised negatively.

This group employed the Editing and Revising Category 5% of the time. Generally, they demonstrated concern for the form and mechanics of the writing rather than the content of the story. They demonstrated concern for proper spelling, punctuation and capitalization more frequently than showing concern for shaping the meaning of the story. Perl (1979) found that unskilled college writers exhibited concern for correct form in their writing process and this frequently interfered with developing the ideas in the story. When the qualitative scores, as analyzed in the previous section, are considered with the concern for form and mechanics, Perl's (1979) finding seems to hold true in the present study.

Only 16 statements or 8% of the total writing process of the group was devoted to decision-making behaviours. Generally, this group tended to accept (69%) rather than reject ideas (31%). A possible explanation may be in the inability of this group to discern among the ideas generated which are most appropriate to their stories. Another explanation may reside in the tendency of this group to hurry through the writing process and to avoid writing encounters. To this end, it does not seem surprising that this group would accept rather than reject ideas because in

rejecting ideas, additional writing would be required.

Within the Miscellaneous Category, this group exhibited concern for the sub-category Ambivalence. At least 63% of the statements which fell in the Miscellaneous Category reflected uncertainty about the written product and the students' abilities to write. Studies conducted by Daly (1979) and Selfe (1983) have found that high apprehensives are unsure about writing and approach the task with a certain degree of ambivalence. To this end, the finding of the present study is supported in the literature.

Research Question 5

What is the nature of the writing process employed by low apprehensive writers?

Tables 9 and 10 respectively parallel Tables 7 and 8 for the previous research question but focus upon the low apprehensive group. The findings as illustrated in Tables 9 and 10 are reported below.

The low apprehensive group verbalized 567 statements which provided insight into the writing process. The most frequent classification of statements (34%) reflected concern for the major

Table 9

Classification of Statements According to the Major Process Categories—Low Apprehensive Group

Process Categories	Statements	Percentage
A. Planning	191	34%
B. Translating	154	27%
C. Evaluation	9	1%
D. Editing/Revising	78	14%
E. Writing Strategies	1	.1%
F. Decision Making	79	14%
G. Miscellaneous	55	10%

Table 10

Classification of Statements According to the Minor Process Categories--Low Apprehensive Group

Category	Components		Statements	Percentage
Planning	1.1	Beginning	8	4%
	1.2	Ending	6	3%
(Total = 191 or	1.3	Setting	14	7%
34%)	1.4	Plot	45	24%
	1.5	Naming	9	5%
	1.6	Lexicon	19	10%
	1.7	Character	68	36%
	1.8	Non-Specific	22	12%
Translating	2.1	with elaboration	58	38%
	2.2	without elaboration	42	27%
(Total = 154 or	2.3	truncation	54	35%
27%)				
Evaluating	3.1	own writing	7	78%
(Total = 9 or 1%)	3.2	formal content	2	22%
Edit/Revising	4.1	rdg/content	10	13%
	4.2	rdg/form	1	1%
(Total = 78 or 14%)	4.3	rdg/non-specific	40	51%
	5.1	spelling	9	12%
	5.2	punct/capit.	1	1%
	5.3	grammar	4	5%
	5.4	organization	5	6%
	6.1	lexicon	3	4%
	6.2	meaning	5	6%
Writing Strategies	7.1	writing/generate	0	0%
	7.2	rdg/generate	1	100%
(Total = 1 or .1%)	7.3	sources/generate	0	0%

Table 11, continued

Classification of Statements According to the Minor Process Categories—High Apprehensive Group

Category	Components		Statements	Percentage
Decision-Making	8.1	selecting	43	54%
	8.2	rejecting	36	46%
(Total = 79 or 14%)				
Miscellaneous	9.0	reviewing	14	25%
	10.0	ambivalence	13	24%
(Total = 55 or 10%)	11.0	production	27	49%
	12.0	non-specific	1	2%

category labelled "Planning". Hence, the statements about the writing process verbalized by this group demonstraed concern for generating ideas which could be used in their stories.

Next to the Planning Category, the low apprehensive group employed the Translating Category (27%) most frequently. The large proportion of statements for the Translating Category reveal that low apprehensive students rehearse their ideas frequently before committing them to paper.

The Planning and Translating categories comprised 61% of the statements about the writing process. This indicates that these students were concerned about generating ideas and frequently transformed these ideas into oral language before including them in their written stories.

The classification of statements according to the major process categories further indicated that low apprehensive students seldom verbalized concern for the evaluation of their written products (1%) nor did they verbalize the strategies they used while writing (.1%). Statements which revealed editing and/or revising behaviours comprised 14% of the statements and a similar percentage was found to be true for statements which reflected decision-making behaviours. Statements

comprising the Miscellaneous category fell to 10% of the total statements about the writing process.

Within the Planning Category, this group appeared most concerned with generating ideas to illustrate the characterizations in the story. The minor process component, labelled "Characterizations", generated ideas which would illustrate character descriptions, feelings, moods, dialogue and character activities and comprised 36% of the statements within the Planning Category. The process component which generated ideas to advance the plot of the story comprised 24% of the total Planning Category. The low apprehensive group appeared least concerned with generating ideas which could be used to end the story.

Within the Translating Category, there appeared to be an almost equal distribution among the three translating behaviours - rehearsing without elaboration (38%), rehearsing with elaboration (27%) and rehearsing with truncation (35%). Some students appeared to use this category almost to the exclusion of others. Mike's statements (82%), for example, reflected frequent use of this category. The verbalizations of other students, however, indicated that this category was seldom used. Sue, for example, did not verbalize any statements which reflected the use of this

category. Hence, while the group as a whole verbalized numerous statements which reflected use of the Translating process, individual differences within the group indicate that some students rarely verbalized statements which focussed on the Translating category.

The low apprehensive group did not exhibit a concern for evaluating their writing as the category labelled Evaluation Behaviours comprised only 1% of the statements. Generally, therefore, students did not appraise the form and/or content of their stories nor did they appraise their abilities as writers. Two students, Sue and Mike, did not engage in any evaluation behaviours. Colleen and Karen, however, did demonstrate some evaluation of their writing but only to a limited extent. While Colleen engaged in evaluation 1% of the total writing process, Karen engaged in this behaviour only 2% of the time. The evaluations these students offered were all positive. They liked what they wrote and exhibited confidence in their writing. The limited use of this category may reside in several factors. First, this group exhibited confidence in their writing and to this end accepted that their writing was satisfactory. Secondly, grade six students may be much more familiar with external sources for evaluating their writing than the

self-evaluation required in this category. Thirdly, these students may have evaluated covertly without verbalizing their thoughts.

The Editing and Revising Category comprised 14% of the statements about the writing process made by the low apprehensive group. The statements revealed that these students generally were more concerned with editing and revising the content and mechanics of the written text than editing and/or revising the ideas contained in the written text. For one student, Sue, 40% of her statements reflected the use of this category. The three remaining students, Karen, Colleen and Mike, respectively made statements about the Editing and Revising Category 4%, 19% and 0% of the time.

Within the low apprehensive group only one student, Sue, offered one statement which provided insight into the type of writing strategy she used while writing. Her statement indicated that she relied upon rereading in order to generate ideas based upon what had already been written.

The category labelled Decision-Making Behaviours comprised 14% of the statements. The statements indicated that selecting ideas (54%) and rejecting ideas (46%) were almost evenly balanced.

Within the Miscellaneous Category, the low apprehensive group demonstrated their concern for the production of a written piece 49% of the time. Their verbalizations indicated that they were interested in phrasing pieces of text in a manner which would most appropriately convey their intended meaning. This group, too, reviewed parts of the written text without specifically rereading the text 25% of the time and indicated some ambivalence about the written product or their writing 24% of the time. For the latter sub-category, however, one student tended to be more ambivalent than the others. Out of 13 statements which indicated some degree of ambivalence, Colleen verbalized 10 of them.

Research Question 6

How are the writing processes employed by the high and low apprehensive groups similar and/or different?

Table 11 represents the extent to which the statements of the high apprehensive and low apprehensive groups were classified into the major process categories. The findings as illustrated in this table together with Tales 7, 8, 9 and 10 are

Table 11

Comparisons of Statements According to the Major Process Categories--High and Low Apprehensive Group

	High Group	Low Group
A. Planning	43%	34%
B. Translating	32%	27%
C. Evaluating	1%	1%
D. Edit/Rev.	5%	14%
E. Strategies	1%	.1%
F. Deciding	8%	14%
G. Miscellaneous	8%	10%

reported below.

While the high apprehensive group verbalized 196 discrete statements which offered insight into the writing process, the low apprehensive group verbalized 567 statements. To this end, the low apprehensive group generated almost three times as many statements when compared to their high apprehensive counterparts. The greater number of statements made about the writing process by the low apprehensive group may reflect either greater language facility or a greater awareness of their own writing.

Statements made about the writing process indicated that low writing apprehensives seemed to have a slightly greater variety of concerns across the categories. For both groups, however, the major Planning Category comprised the largest proportion of statements about the writing process. Hence, the writing processes of both groups revealed concern for generating ideas that could be included in the story. Even though both groups devoted much of their writing process to the Planning Category, the extent to which they used the different components within this category differed. The high apprehensives were more concerned with generating ideas which would advance the plot and ideas which would articulate time references and places

within the story. The low apprehensive group, on the other hand, were more concerned with developing the characterizations within the story. This group, too, demonstrated concern for generating ideas which would develop the plot but to a lesser extent than their high apprehensive counterparts. For both groups the component concerned with generating ideas for concluding the story was employed least frequently.

For both groups statements concerned with translating were the second most frequent type. The high apprehensives demonstrated that they used the Translating Category 32% of the time compared to the 27% figure for the low apprehensive group. The males in both groups employed this category more frequently than the females in the sample. The frequency distribution for the three components within the Translating Category for both groups appeared to be almost equal. Hence, neither group appeared to favor one component over the other.

Neither group exhibited much concern for the Evaluation Category. Both groups employed this category only 1% of the time. However, students in the low apprehensive group who did engage in some evaluation behaviour tended to appraise their writing in a positive manner while the nature of he appraising

that occurred in the high apprehensive group reflected negative appraisals.

The low apprehensive group (27%) tended to edit and/or revise their written products much more frequently than the high apprehensive group (5%). While the low apprehensive group employed all the sub-categories of Editing and Revising Category, the high apprehensive group demonstrated that they only focussed upon the components which were concerned with rereading and considering form. Both groups did exibit that when engaged in editing and/or revising behaviours they were, for the mos part, concerned with checking the form and mechanics of the writing. The low apprehensive group, however, when compared to the high apprehensive group display greater concern for checking the ideas in the story.

Both the high apprehensive and the low apprehensive groups verbalized only a limited number of statements which shed light upon the strategies they used while immersed in the writing process. While the high apprehensive group only verbalized two statements, the low apprehensive group verbalized one statement. The nature of the strategies that were verbalized demonstrated concern for generating ideas. These strategies exemplified the "how" of generating of

ideas.

The low apprehensive group exhibited more decision-making behaviours (14%) than the high apprehensive group (8%). Generally, both groups accepted rather than rejected ideas. However, the low apprehensive group demonstrated that they were much more selective about the ideas which would fit their story since they rejected many more ideas than their high apprehensive counterparts.

Four sub-categories comprised the major category labelled "Miscellaneous Behaviours". Within this major category, the low apprehensives revealed that they were concerned about the production of a particular written piece (49%). Statements such as "how should I phrase this" were frequent. The high apprehensives, on the other hand, did not exhibit concern for the production of a written piece. Once an idea was generated and selected, they tended to write the idea without much regard for intent or phrasing.

Discussion

The statements of students in both groups revealed a concern for planning and generating ideas which could be included in the story. Selfe (1980) found that low apprehensives used written prefiguring in planning

their stories more frequently than high apprehensives. In written prefiguring students use a variety of means to plan their stories on paper. The present study found that the students who participated in this study planned mentally. A partial explanation which may account for the different findings may reside in the age levels of the sample in either study. Students comprising the sample in Selfe's (1980) study were college students and students in this study were at an age level commensurate with grade six children. Perhaps, older students who have had a greater amount of writing experience tend to make greater use of written prefiguring than younger students.

For both groups generating generally tended to occur while pausing during the writing process. Since 43% of the statements of the high apprehensive group revealed concern for planning the story compared to 34% of the statements of the low apprehensive group, the writing process of the high apprehensive student may be characterized as consisting of many pauses. The low apprehensive group, on the other hand, exhibited longer periods of writing and fewer pauses. Several factors may account for this finding. First, high apprehensive students may be less sure about what to write next and to this end pause more frequently in order to plan

locally or at the phrase or sentence level. The high frequency of verbalizations which express ambivalence within the writing process to some extent supports this notion. Low apprehensives, on the other hand, may have generated a number of ideas on a global level and are therefore able to write for longer periods. Secondly, the low apprehensive group, may generate ideas while writing causing them to continue writing rather than to pause and verbalize their thoughts.

The distribution of the Rehearsing Category indicated that both groups tended to rehearse ideas before committing them to paper. For both groups, however, the boys tended to demonstrate reliance on this category more frequently than the girls who tended to employ the full range of the categories. The boys, on the other hand, used this category almost to the exclusion ot others.

Humes (1983) states that "Translating makes huge demands on writers' cognitive processes because translating is so complex: Writers must put ideas into written language while they are also dealing with problems of discourse coherence and structure." (p.208). She also cites recent research by Gould (1980) and Glassner (1980) which found that as the writing process becomes more automatic less conscious

attention is given to translating. Given the foregoing, the automaticity of the writing process of students comprising this sample, especially the boys, has not been well developed. One student, Sue, who wrote prolifically at home and at school did not employ the Translating Category at all. She generated ideas on a global level and did not transform mental images to oral language before writing about her ideas. Sue's writing process may support the findings of Gould (1980) and Glassner (1980).

Both groups employed the Evaluation Category to a very limited extent (1%). However, when they did appraise their writing, the low apprehensive group tended to appraise positively while the high apprehensive group tended to appraise negatively. The limited extent to which these students employed the Evaluation Category may reside in the fact that they are either unfamiliar with the self-evaluation process or that they prefer external evaluation sources such as teachers or parents.

The literature tends to support the finding that high apprehensives appraise negatively and that low apprehensives appraise positively. Daly and Miller (1975) have found that the self-confidence displayed by low apprehensive writers contributes to more positive

appraisals. High apprehensive writers, on the other hand, have not experienced much success in writing and in fact may have become apprehensive because of negative appraisals about writing by others and to this end, therefore, lack confidence in their writing abilities and assess their writing in a negative manner.

The low apprehensive group revised and edited with greater frequency than the high apprehensive group. Corrections tended to occur continually during the writing process. At times the corrections were paper and pencil corrections which required that changes be made to the written text. At other times the corrections involved changing an idea that had been generated but not yet written. Most frequently, however, corrections tended to reflect the former. On the whole, both groups displayed concern for correcting the surface features of the written text rather than the meaning of the text. The findings in the present study are supported in the literature which suggest that young writers tend to be more concerned with correcting the form and mechanics of writing than the ideas contained in the text.

The low apprehensive group tended to be more selective about the ideas that would be used in the

story in that they tended to reject more ideas than the high apprehensive group. Because low apprehensive students tend to write more, they might have developed a better sense of audience and a better sense of which ideas would fit their particular story schema. The high apprehensives generally tended to accept rather than reject ideas. The literature indicates that the high apprehensive writer avoids writing and hurries through the writing process. In accepting the ideas that are forged, the high apprehensive writer avoids long writing sessions because rejecting ideas would require more time to generate new ideas. Moreover, the literature also indicates that high apprehensive writers do not have a well developed sense of audience. Their writing may be quite egocentric in nature. That is, if the idea makes sense to them, it should make sense to others.

The low apprehensive group tended to be much more concerned about how to phrase a specific idea in the written text. The high apprehensive writer, on the other hand, did not exhibit similar concerns. To this end, the low apprehensive group was not only more concerned about the ideas in the story but also about how these ideas would be expressed.

The Relationship Between the Written Product and the Writing Process

The major research question which this section addresses focusses upon the relationship between the written product and the writing process for both groups. The Tables used in the previous two sections will be used in order to illustrate the comparisons and contrasts. The questions together with the findings are reported below.

Research Question 7

Is there a relationship between the written products and the writing processes of high apprehensive and low apprehensive writers?

The low apprehensive group when compared to their high apprehensive counterparts not only verbalized twice as many statements about the writing process but they also wrote stories which contained twice as many words. With respect to length, it was also found that story length was related to evaluations of the written product. The low apprehensive group averaged twice as many words per story and were evaluated more positively

across all features of the Sager Writing Scale.

On the relationship between statements about the writing process and the length of a written product, individual variations to the above findings, however, did exist. In the low apprehensive group one student, Sue, was the most prolific writer. While Sue wrote 1068 words in her story, she contributed the least number of statements (47) when compared to other low apprehensive students. In the high apprehensive group, Cynthia'story contained the least number of words (162). However, in her group she verbalized the greatest number of statements (101). Despite these differences, however, the general tendency illustrated that the length of the written product as computed by a simple word count reflected the number of verbalizations of the writing process.

The frequency distribution of the Planning Category for both groups indicated that the high apprehensive group (43%) employed this category proportionately more frequently than the high apprehensive group (34%). Hence, even though the high apprehensive group verbalized more statements which reflected concern for the generation of ideas when compared to their low apprehensive counterparts, their stories were only half as long.

The low apprehensive group tended to employ the process component labelled Generating Lexical Items more frequently than the high apprehensive group. Low apprehensives displayed concern for generating specific words which would adequately convey their thoughts and intentions. The high apprehensive group did not exhibit this same concern. The concern of the low apprehensive group about the lexical items in their stories is refleted in higher scores on qualitative analysis featuring vocabulary.

Similar trends were noted with respect to the process components which highlighted naming and characterizations. The low apprehensive group exhibited greater concern for naming the characters, places and/or objects in the story and they also attached greater importance to illustrating character feelings, moods, activities, descriptions and dialogue when compared to their high apprehensive counterparts. Because the low apprehensive group elaborated more frequently upon characterizations and were more specific w[illegible]ing, they also tended to use a more interesting and varied vocabulary in their stories. This, for the most part, helped contribute to their higher vocabulary scores in the qualitative analysis of their written products. To this end, it appears that

the process components which specifically relate to the generation of a precise lexicon and the components which spur the elaboration of ideas in the written text have an impact upon the qualitative features of the written product, especially vocabulary.

The high apprehensive group demonstrated that they were very much concerned with the process component labelled Plot Development. Within the Planning Category, they employed this component 19% of the time compared to the 7% for the low apprehensive group. While the high apprehensive group exhibited greater concern for generating ideas to develop the plot of the story, their stories not only contained fewer words, fewer T-units and fewer words per T-unit but were also rated less positively by three raters evaluating the organization and elaboration of the written text. By and large the three raters generally felt that the stories of the high apprehensive group were not as well developed as those stories written by the low apprehensive group. To this end, greater proportional usage of the Plot Development Component did not necessarily affect the written product in a positive manner.

Both the high apprehensive and the low apprehensive groups employed the major process category

"Translating" with similar frequencies. Both groups, therefore, demonstrated that they frequently rehearsed or transformed ideas into oral language before committing these ideas to paper.

Daly (1979) and others suggest that high apprehensive writers tend to exhibit truncation in their writing more frequently than low apprehensive writers. For the "Translating Category" in the present study, this was not found to be true. In fact, the high apprehensive group tended to elaborate upon their oral rehearsal in their writing more frequently than the low apprehensive group and the latter group tended to truncate their rehearsal in their writing more frequently than the former group. In the present study it was found that the nature of the truncations involved the synthesizing of rehearsals into more precise language. This, in turn, was found to have a positive effect upon the evaluation of the written product, especially the feature which focussed upon vocabulary.

The high apprehensive group tended to accept rather than reject the ideas they generated. This was true for the low apprehensive group too. However, the latter group demonstrated that they were much more selective because they rejected more ideas than the

former group. In rejecting ideas the low apprehensive group revealed that relating one idea to the next was important. They also indicated concern for conveying their particualr meanings and concern for reader interest. On the latter, some students rejected ideas because they might have been "boring". Since the high apprehensive group accepted most of the ideas they generated, regardless of meaning, organization and/or structure, their written language products were frequently disjointed and the reader was left to infer the intended meaning of the writer. These qualities resulted in less favorable evaluations.

In contrast to the low apprehensive group, who exhibited concern for the production of a written piece, the high apprehensive group displayed no concern at all. They generally wrote the first idea they generated without regard to stylistic concerns. Because the low apprehensive group were more concerned about writing style, their stories were more readable and interesting from a stylistic point of view resulting in more positive evaluations by the three raters.

Discussion

In the present study several relationships between the written product and the writing process were found to exist. Story length was found to be related to the number of verbalizations of the writing process. This is not surprising in light of the fact that longer stories to some extent involve the writer for longer periods of time in the writing process and to this end may result in more verbalizations about the process.

The present study also found that longer stories tended to be evaluated more positively than shorter stories. That is, the longer stories written by the low apprehensive group were evaluated more positively than the shorter stories written by the high apprehensive group. Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) suggest that "Total length is one indication of the invention skills of a writer." (p.19). To this end, the longer stories written by low apprehensives may have reflected their abilities to develop ideas in their written texts.

Although high apprehensives spent a greater proportion of their time on generating ideas to develop the plot of the story when compared to the low apprehensive group, the written products of the former

were not as well developed. It would appear that the written products of students who verbalized a great number of statements which reflected concern for developing the plot of the story, would be evaluated more positively. In this study, however, this was not found to be true. In fact, the greater proportional usage of the minor process category labelled "Plot Development" did not necessarily affect the written product in a positive manner. What appears possible for the high apprehensive group is that although they spent a great proportion of their planning time on generating ideas to advance the plot of the story, they were less successful in including and/or elaborating upon these ideas in their writing.

Statements about the components of the writing process requiring specificity and/or elaboration on the part of the writer were found to relate to the written product. Generally, the low apprehensive group elaborated more frequently and were much more concerned about specific information in their writing. These specifics may have included particular names used in the story or particular lexical choices which would convey their intended meanings. This relationship may indicate that low apprehensive writers have greater language abilities because they are capable of

generating names, various lexical choices to convey one idea and capable of using descriptive vocabulary. On the other hand, the high apprehensive group may also exhibit similar abilities in oral language but their concern for the form and the mechanics of the writing, as demonstrated by the large number of revisions and editing behaviours in this category, may have inhibited the type of behaviour displayed by the low apprehensive group.

The low apprehensive group generated a greater number of statements which reflected usage of the minor process component labelled Rehearsing with Truncation. The nature of the truncations revealed that these students frequently synthesized their oral language into more precise vocabulary in the written text and that this in turn positively affected the qualitative evaluations of their stories. For example, the oral rehearsal, "I tried to make ready some type of weapon" was written as "I tried to construct a weapon". By comparing the transcripts with the written products for this group similar examples can be found.

The high apprehensive group generally did not synthesize the ideas they expressed in their oral language rehearsals. They elaborated in the writing but generally did so by adding a word or phrase. For

example, the rehearsal, "What the creatures are going to look like," was written as "The creatures are going to look like us.". The nature of the rehearsing characteristic of this group did not necessarily add to the quality of the written product.

Low apprehensives demonstrated that they were more selective about the ideas that would be included in the story than high apprehensives. The ability to reject ideas resulted in language products which were rated more positively because ideas generally were related and flowed smoothly from one idea to the next. The high apprehensive group, on the other hand, tended to write the first idea that was generated without much regard for the relationship of the idea to the ideas already contained in the story. The degree of ambivalence shown by the high apprehensive group may be a partial explanation for their tendency to accept rather than reject ideas. High apprehensives generally demonstrated more uncertainty about the writing process, content, mechanics and/or form of the story than the low apprehensive group. Because high apprehensives expressed ambivalence, they may also have been uncertain about the ideas which would fit their

The Profiles

To supplement the answers to the individual research questions and to provide further insight into the writing processes of apprehensive writers, this section presents the profiles of two student writers. The first profile will feature one high apprehensive writer, while the second section will feature one low apprehensive writer.

High Apprehensive Writer: Cynthia

Cynthia was selected for inclusion into the high apprehensive group for at least two reasons. First, her score on the Writing Apprehension Test (70) indicated that she was more apprehensive about writing than 90% of her grade six counterparts. Secondly, her teachers, in particular her Language Arts teacher, indicated that Cynthia avoided writing whenever possible and that she frequently avoided handing in written assignments altogether.

Cynthia's story contained 162 words in 30 T-units, with an average of approximately 5 words per T-unit. Within her group, Cynthia wrote the least number of words with the lowest average number of words per

T-unit.

Generally, Cynthia's sentences were of the simple subject-predicate variety. Only two of her sentences contained subordinate clauses which were used to indicate a time reference.

Although Cynthia's story centers upon the space adventures of two characters, she neither names them nor does she provide a description of them. She merely refers to them as "my friend and I". The fact that Cynthia avoids both naming her characters and elaborating upon them is characteristic of her writing in general. That is, her writing generally lacks both specificity and elaboration.

In developing the plot of the story, Cynthia generally tends to rely upon the dialogue that occurs between the two characters. However, the nature of the dialogue is vague in that she neither identifies the speaker nor does the dialogue flow smoothly from one idea to the next. Instead, the dialogue appears to be a simple cataloguing of statements made by the characters in her story. With respect to correct form, Cynthia frequently neglects to use quotation marks.

In the example below, Cynthia's characters have arrived on the planet and are debating whether they should enter a hut they have encountered:

Let's go in. Oh, I don't know. O.K. Come on. O.K. See there's nothing in here.

The dialogue described above is typical of the story written by Cynthia. In her own mind she may have a clear understanding of who is talking and even what the characters may be feeling but she does not elaborate upon these ideas in her written work and leaves the reader to infer from what she has written the particulars which surround the dialogue.

On the qualitative analysis of the story, Cynthia scored 8 points out of a possible total of 36; the least number of points of all students as evaluated by three independent raters. On the four features analyzed, she scored the least number of points for vocabulary (1). Generally, Cynthia used common words and there was very little variety of word choice. The vagueness which surrounded her dialogue was also characteristic of her word choice in general. That is, she preferred to use vague and general words more frequently than specific and exact words. For example, Cynthia merely mentions the hut but makes no effort to describe the hut nor does she elaborate upon the feelings of the characters as they approach or enter the hut.

Cynthia scored the most points for organization (3). Although her story is not organized into a number of paragraphs, the ideas are arranged in logical order. The story has both an identifiable beginning and ending and the

ideas contained in the story are all relevant to the main idea of the story and developed in sequence. However, while the ideas, for the most part, are all related to the main idea of the story, these ideas are not developed enough to capture reader interest because the elaboration of supporting ideas or details is minimal. That is, the ideas are organized into a number of discrete statements which are all related to the main idea of the story and to this end the main idea is to some extent elaborated upon but not the ideas themselves. For example, in one sentence, Cynthia writes, "The scientists were wrong.". This statement is related to the main idea of the story because her characters have been invited on a space journey but in her story she fails to elaborate what it is the scientists were wrong about and how she derived this conclusion.

While composing aloud, Cynthia verbalized 101 statements which provided insight into the composing process. The majority of her statements expressed concern for generating ideas which may be included in the written story (48 statements). Although Cynthia used the full range of generating components, she used the component concerned with generating ideas to advance the plot of the story most frequently (21 statements). While Cynthia appears to express concern for the ideas in the story and in particular the ideas which will advance the plot of the story, her written

product does not reflect this concern. In fact, her story contains few details and very little description about the sequence of events in the story. Generally, Cynthia tends to truncate her ideas while writing. A case in point is her statement about the "scientists". While thinking aloud, she states:

> Now I'm trying to decide whether the scientists were right that there were living organisms on the planet beside the plants. So, I'm going to put that they don't see any organisms around there. So, I'm just gonna say that the scientists were wrong.

Even though Cynthia elaborates upon her ideas while planning and generating the ideas for inclusion in her story, she does not bring these ideas to fruition in her writing. Cynthia's inability to elaborate upon the ideas in her writing, to some extent, causes her story to be somewhat disjointed, leaving gaps to be filled in by the reader.

Cynthia frequently transforms her ideas into oral language before committing them to paper. Thirty percent of her statements indicate that she rehearses her ideas before writing about them. Most frequently the rehearsal is a close approximation of the written text.

While commenting retrospectively, Cynthia revealed that she relied upon a number of strategies while writing. These strategies generally reflected the "how" of writing.

Naming her story appeared to be Cynthia's first concern as she prepared to write her story and her strategy for

selecting a title revealed that the topic played a major role. When asked to explain how she derived the title of her story, Cynthia states, "I called it A Trip Into Space because that's what the story is about.". This indicates that Cynthia's strategy for selecting a title is to extrapolate from the assigned topic an appropriate title.

Although the introspective comments exhibit limited concern for naming and the specifics of the story, the retrospective comments demonstrate some concern in this regard. She chooses to name her planet Jupiter simply because she could not think of other names. She indicates, however, that she did give some thought to naming the planet but because she was unable to generate either a unique name or another real name, she chooses to select the first idea that came to mind. With respect to naming her characters, Cynthia indicates retrospectively that she did not attend either to naming her characters during the writing process or to specifying the names of the speakers in the dialogue that occurs in her story.

Although the introspective comments generally express most concern for planning on a local level, the retrospective comments indicate that Cynthia also plans on a global level . In the introspective comments, for example, she frequently says, "I'm thinking of what I can put down next" and this reveals her tendency to plan at the sentence or phrase level.

However, when asked if she knew at the beginning how the story would end, she answers, "I thought we would be okay at the end.". To this end, it appears that Cynthia's most frequent concern is for the ideas that come next while writing but that she is also cognizant of how she wishes the story to develop on a more global level.

Cynthia's retrospective comments provide further insight into the strategies she employs during the writing process. To generate ideas Cynthia generally relies upon three main strategies. These strategies include generating while writing, spontaneous idea development and the use of background knowledge.

Generating ideas while writing is exemplary of the simultaneous nature of Cynthia's writing process. Retrospectively, she indicates that while writing she thinks of other ideas that could come next in the story. The forging of new ideas also appears to occur spontaneously. That is, when she consciously attends to the generation of new ideas, she states that "thoughts pop into her head". When Cynthia employs this strategy, she generally chooses the first idea that comes to mind without reflection upon the suitability of the idea to the story in general. Relying upon background knowledge to generate new ideas is another strategy employed by Cynthia. In her story she writes, "It's good that we can breathe oxygen.". Retrospectively, she

reasons that the plants on the planet give off oxygen and this enables them to breathe. When using this strategy, Cynthia appears much more reflective about the types of ideas she generates and includes in her written story.

While composing aloud, Cynthia verbalized three statements which indicate concern for editing and/or revising. Although her final story still has numerous errors, she does revise errors much more frequently than the three editing and/or revising statements would indicate because she frequently corrected errors without verbalizing about them. The strategy used most frequently for correcting errors is to reread the written product and to correct errors as she encounters them. This strategy exemplifies the recursive nature of her writing process. That is, she writes part of her story and then goes back to correct errors.

While commenting retrospectively, Cynthia indicates that she does not consider herself to be a good writer and that she does not like to write. She further suggests that she is concerned about being graded on her writing because such marks inevitably appear on her report card. She appears to have a good notion of what it is that good writers do when asked to comment upon this. She states, for example, that good writers elaborate more, they include more detail and are much better organized.

Low Apprehensive Writer: Sue

Sue was selected for inclusion in the low apprehensive group because her score on the Writing Apprehension Test fell within the bottom 10% of the total range of scores. This indicated that when compared to many of her grade six counterparts, Sue was less anxious about writing than other students. Moreover, her teachers indicated that Sue enjoyed school sponsored writing and that she engaged in self-initiated writing frequently at home. Rather than avoiding writing, Sue approached writing willingly and with a sense of enjoyment.

Of all the students that participated in the present study, Sue's story contained the greatest number of words (1068). Her story contained 108 T-units with each T-unit averaging almost 10 words. What appears to contribute to the overall length of Sue's story is that when she generates an idea, she both develops, and elaborates upon, the idea. While in the spacecraft, for example, she includes three major adventures that her characters experience. Each adventure centers upon one major idea and each idea is developed with a number of related details. Sue includes a variety of sentences in her story. Because subordinate clauses are used frequently, she averages almost 10 words per T-unit rather than the 5 words per T-unit averaged by Cynthia

who tended to write sentences of the simple subject - predicate variety.

Three independent raters evaluated Sue's story very positively. Out of a possible total of 36 points, Sue scored 34 points. On features which analyzed organization and elaboration, Sue was credited with the full possible total of 9 points by the three raters. For vocabulary and structure Sue was credited with 8 out of a possible of 9 points.

Both the organization and elaboration within the story indicated that Sue captured the interest of the reader by developing the main idea of the story with a number of supporting details which flowed smoothly from one idea to the next. The details which Sue included all related to the main idea of the story and specified character feelings and also elaborated upon the events that occurred in the story.

While composing aloud Sue verbalized 47 statements about the writing process. Her tendency to use exact rather than vague language becomes apparent in the analysis of the various kinds of statements she makes about the writing process. Many of the statements, for example, exhibit concern for naming. She specifies the names of all the characters in the story, the name of the space center and the name of the planet. She also exhibits concern for generating lexical choices which will convey her intended meaning. In several statements, for example, she says, "What kind of

words would give more meaning to what I want to say?". Hence, as Sue writes and chooses the words to convey the ideas of the story, she is concerned not only about the idea but also about how best to word the idea so as to reveal her intended meaning.

Statements about the writing process reflect an almost equal concern for planning or generating ideas for the story and editing and/or revising parts of her story. Each of these categories comprise about 49% of the statements about the writing process. To this end, therefore, it appears that while the development of the story is important to Sue, the correctness of the story assumes equal importance.

Sue engages in a great deal of rereading while composing. This and the fact that she revises while composing illustrates the recursive nature of her writing process. She does not simply progress in a linear fashion, moving from one idea to the next. Instead, as she records her ideas on the page she continually checks backward to compare her written ideas to the ideas she is planning to put in the story.

While commenting retrospectively about the writing process, Sue indicated that she relied upon a number of strategies that would facilitate the editing and/or revising of her written story. Some of these strategies include rereading parts of the written product to check for errors,

editing and/or revising the first draft of the story and relying upon external sources such as parents and teachers for errors that may need to be corrected.

The retrospective comments also indicated that Sue was fully aware of the strategies she employed to generate ideas for inclusion in the story. Some of these strategies include reliance upon background knowledge, generating while writing, rereading to generate, spontaneous idea development and planning on a global level.

She indicated that she relied upon background knowledge to generate ideas which would add to the realism of the story. Sue frequently generated while writing because there were relatively few pauses while she composed indicating that as she wrote, more ideas came to her mind which allowed her to continue writing. She states, for example, that "As I start to write, I'll get deeper and deeper into he story and then it'll just kind of flow on the paper as I write.". She also develops ideas spontaneously. She indicates that when she needs a new idea, a good idea will frequently "pop" into her head. Planning the overall development of the story or planning the story on a global level is a strategy upon which Sue relied while writing her story. Knowing beforehand how she wished the story to develop allowed her to select and generate the ideas and details which would fit the general structure of her story. She knew, for example, that her

characters would have three different adventures while in the spacecraft. The planning of this beforehand allowed her to fill in the ideas and details as she came to each adventure.

Sue revealed that she was greatly concerned about the reader while she wrote. She states that one of her concerns is to "make sure that the things that I'm writing are action packed enough for the reader to be interested in them.". She also indicated that the story should make sense to the reader and that she makes an effort to relate the ideas that are contained in the story. Audience awareness, therefore, plays a significant role for Sue while she writes.

Sue indicated that she both enjoyed writing and that she was confident in her writing abilities. She evaluated her own writing positively and indicated that she would like to continue writing as she grows older. When Sue was asked to participate in this study, she was involved in publishing a book of poetry which she created during her spare time.

Discussion

A comparison of the two profiles revealed that writing apprehension levels may have several effects upon the written language product. It also divulged differences in the nature of the statements made about the writing process and attitudes about writing in general.

Whereas Sue, a low apprehensive writer, wrote a lengthy story containing 1068 words with 108 T-units which averaged almost 10 words per T-unit, Cynthia, a high apprehensive writer, wrote a story that only contained 162 words with 30 T-units which averaged 5 words per T-unit. To this end, therefore, it appears that writing apprehension affects a number of quantitative indices. This finding is corroborated in recent research evidence by Book (1976), Daly (1977) and Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981). These studies have shown that high apprehensives write shorter stories containig fewer T-units of shorter duration when compared to the stories written by their low apprehensive counterparts.

Three independent raters evaluated the written language products of low apprehensive writers more positively on all the features analyzed when compared to the evaluations of the stories written by high apprehensive writers. Out of a possible total of 36 points, Cynthia scored 8 points and Sue scored 34 points. Faigley Daly and Witte (1981) and Garcia (1977) support the present research finding that low apprehensives tend to be evaluated more positively than high apprehensives.

On the whole, Sue's story tended to be better organized and she elaborated upon her ideas by using a number of supporting details which flowed smoothly from one idea to the next. While Cynthia's story reflected some concern for story

organization in that her story had an identifiable beginning, middle and end, the ideas contained in the story were not elaborated. Her story appeared to catalogue a number of ideas which were written in simple sentences. In merely listing a number of ideas, Cynthia's story lacked the elaboration of main ideas and this in turn affected the extent to which ideas flowed smoothly from one idea to the next.

In contrast to Cynthia, Sue exhibited concern for specificity and vocabulary usage. While Cynthia used vague and common words and did not attend to naming her characters and places within the story, Sue used words and phrases which were vivid and which would convey her intended meaning.

Whereas Sue verbalized 47 statements about the writing process, Cynthia verbalized 101 statements. The greater number of statements about the writing process verbalized by Cynthia may reside in her tendency to generate on a local level rather than a global level. Cynthia paused frequently to forge new ideas. Sue, on the other hand, wrote for long periods of time without pausing to verbalize her thoughts because she planned on a global level and often generated ideas while composing.

Statements about the writing process indicated that both Cynthia and Sue were concerned most frequently about generating ideas. Cynthia was most concerned about

generating ideas to advance the plot of the story whereas Sue was more concerned about generating names and appropriate lexical choices. Sue's statements about the writing process were reflected in her story in that she used exact vocabulary to convey her ideas and named extensively in her story. Cynthia's concern for generating ideas to advance the plot of the story, however, was not reflected in her written story. While Cynthia verbalized a number of ideas that she generates, she only writes an abbreviated version of her ideas suggesting that she truncates her ideas while writing. Sue, on the other hand, verbalized few ideas but writes prolifically indicating that she elaborates upon her ideas while writing.

Statements about the writing process showed that Cynthia frequently transformed her ideas into oral language before recording them on paper. The frequency with which Cynthia rehearses the written text may indicate an ambivalence she experiences as a writer and the uncertainty she feels about the composing process. Generally, Cynthia lacks writing confidence and rehearsing may help her to transform abstract ideas into more concrete terms before writing about them.

Sue's statements did not reflect the tendency to rehearse ideas. When Sue generated an idea, she generally committed the idea to paper without benefit of an oral rehearsal. Sue's writing confidence perhaps allowed for the

direct recording of abstract ideas.

While commenting retrospectively about the writing process, both Cynthia and Sue indicated that they relied upon a number of strategies to generate ideas. These strategies exemplified the "how" of writing. Sue's retrospective comments demonstrated that she possessed a larger repertoire of writing strategies which she relied upon to generate ideas than Cynthia. In talking about the writing strategies upon which she relied, Sue indicated concern for meaning and concern for audience interest and focussing her strategies upon these concerns may have helped Sue write a story that was both interesting and meaningful. Cynthia, on the other hand, did not demonstrate these same concerns when she explained the strategies she used to generate ideas. Her primary concern centered upon the ideas themselves rather than the meaning these ideas conveyed to the reader.

In the retrospective comments Sue indicated that she wrote prolifically both at home and at school and that currently she was attempting to have one of her poetry books published. She foresaw a future in writing, indicating that future employment would more than likely involve writing. Cynthia, on the other hand, revealed that she was an ambivalent writer, did not possess confidence in her writing abilities, was not sure about the quality of her written product and that she avoided writing whenever possible.

Whereas Cynthia avoids writing, Sue welcomes the challenge of the writing encounter. To this end, the increased exposure to the writing situation experienced by Sue may have enabled her to develop the skills and writing strategies necessary for a successful writer. For Cynthia, however, her attitude toward writing may be a disabling characteristic in that writing avoidance may not allow for the time and practice necessary to develop adequate writing skills.

Summary

Chapter V reported the findings of the study. Insight into the nature of the written products produced, and the writing process used, by low and high apprehensive writers were revealed and discussed. Findings related to the relationship between the writing processes and the written products of the two groups were also presented and discussed. Two profiles featuring one low and one high apprehensive writer supplemented the answers to the individual research questions.

On the subject of the written language products produced by both groups, it was found that high apprehensive writers wrote shorter stories containing fewer T-units of shorter duration. A qualitative analysis revealed that high apprehensive writers were consistently evaluated less

positively than low apprehensive writers on all features examined.

Statements about the writing process revealed that low apprehensives verbalized almost three times as many statements as their high apprehensive counterparts. The nature of the statements made about the writing process suggested that low apprehensives seemed to have a slightly greater variety of concerns across all the process categories. The high apprehensives displayed greater concern for some categories such as Planning and Translating than other categories such as Evaluating and Editing and/or Revising.

The majority of statements verbalized by both groups indicated concern for generating ideas which could be included in the story. However, the extent to which the individual components which comprised the Generating Category were employed by each group differed. The high apprehensive group expressed greater concern for generating ideas which would advance the plot of the story and the low apprehensive group expressed greater concern for generating appropriate names and lexical choices and generating ideas to develop the characterizations within the story.

The Translating Category comprised the second largest proportion of statements about the writing process. Hence, both groups relied upon the transformation of ideas into oral

language before including these ideas in their stories. Individual differences with respect to this category, however, were noted. That is some students employed this category almost to the exclusion of others, while other students did not use this category at all.

Neither group verbalized extensive statements which indicated concern for the evaluation of their written products. It was suggested that grade six students may rely upon external sources to evaluate their written products rather than the self-evaluation characteristic of this category. However, findings did indicate that when students engaged in self-evaluation, the high apprehensives evaluated themselves negatively expressing ambivalence about themselves as writers and uncertainty about the adequacy of their written products. The low apprehensives, on the other hand, expressed confidence both in their abilities to write and in their written products and to this end evaluated themselves positively.

On the relationship between the written product and the writing process for the two groups, it was found that low apprehensives not only wrote longer stories but they also verbalized a proportionately greater number of statements about the writing process. Findings in the present research suggested that longer stories were evaluated more positively than the shorter stories produced by the high apprehensive

group. One factor which may contribute to the above finding may reside in the tendency of low apprehensive writers to elaborate upon their ideas and the tendency of high apprehensive writers to truncate their ideas in their stories.

Statements made about the writing process revealed that high apprehensives were less concerned with the specificity of a story and that they were less concerned about the lexical choices they included in their stories than their low apprehensive counterparts. For the written products of high apprehensive writers this resulted in stories where common and vague language appeared to be the norm rather than the exception. Because of the foregoing, the written products of the high apprehensive group were evaluated less positively than the written products produced by the low apprehensive group.

Statements made about the writing process indicated that the writing process is frequently unique to the individual writer. The profiles of one high apprehensive writer and one low apprehensive writer support this notion.

The present study found that attitudes toward writing may affect writing growth. That is, the low apprehensive writer approached writing with confidence and looked forward to the writing encounter. This was not found to be true for high apprehensive writers. These students generally avoided

writing and lacked confidence in their abilities to write. To this end, it was suggested that confident attitudes may facilitate writing growth because increased exposure to writing may help develop mastery of writing related skills. It was also suggested that the tendency to avoid writing may be a disabling characteristic because infrequent exposure to the writing encounter may diminish opportunities for developing writing skills.

Chapter VI

SUMMARY

Overview

This concluding chapter briefly summarizes the study, presents the major findings of the study as well as the conclusions reached from those findings. Suggestions for further research and implications for teaching are also included.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between writing apprehension and the written product and the writing process among high apprehensive grade six writers. Low apprehensive grade six writers were examined in a similar manner and compared to the high apprehensive writers.

The sample consisted of four students identified as high apprehensive writers and four students identified as low apprehensive writers. A twofold procedure was used to identify levels of writing apprehension; the administration and scoring of the

Writing Apprehension Test and teachers' perceptions of student attitudes toward writing.

To gather data for the analysis of the written language product, students were asked to write extemperaneously on a predetermined narrative topic. Data which provided insight into the writing process involved the videotaping and audiotaping of students while composing aloud. Comments provided retrospectively about the composing session were audiotaped and analyzed for the writing strategies employed by the students and were used to profile one high apprehensive and one low apprehensive writer. All audiotapes were transcribed.

The written language products were analyzed for a number of quantitative indices and for a number of qualitative features. The quantitative indices analyzed the length of the story by way of a simple word count, the number of T-units, herein defined as any independent clause with all its modifiers, and the average number of words per T-unit which involved a simple mathematical computation. The Sager Writing Scale was used to provide a qualitative evaluation of the written products. Three independent raters assessed the written products and the scores they derived for each writing sample were combined to arrive

at a final score for each feature that was analyzed. The four features upon which the analysis focussed included vocabulary, organization, elaboration and structure.

Transcriptions of all the "think aloud" audiotapes allowed for the analysis of the statements made about the writing process and resulted in the development of a coding scheme which focussed upon the major categories, sub-categories and components of the writing process. Application of the coding scheme to the "think aloud" protocols provided insight into the nature of the composing processes employed by high and low apprehensive writers.

The audiotapes of the retrospective comments students made about the composing session were also transcribed and analyzed for the strategies students employed while composing a story. The coding scheme developed for the analysis of the "think aloud" protocols was not applied to the analysis of the retrospective comments because the retrospective statements were largely the result of researcher initiated questions. Relationships between the written product and the writing process for students comprising the high and low apprehensive groups involved the comparison and analysis of the

quantitative indices and the qualitative evaluations of the written products with the statements made about the writing process.

Conclusions

This study involved a small sample, four high apprehensive and four low apprehensive students, who were involved in one writing task. To this end, the small sample and the singular writing task place limitations upon the generalizability of the findings in the present study. However, a number of conclusions were derived from the present study. These conclusions are presented in four sections. The first and second sections respectively will present conclusions related to the written language product and the writing process. The third section provides the conclusions about the relationship between the written product and the writing process and the fourth section will present the conclusions which were reached as the result of a descriptive analysis which profiled one high and one low apprehensive writer. The conclusions reached about each of the sections and their respective questions are presented below.

The Written Language Product

This section explored three major research questions:

1. What is the nature of the written products produced by high apprehensive writers?

2. What is the nature of the written products produced by low apprehensive writers?

3. How are the written products of the two groups similar and/or different?

Discussion

In comparing the written language products of the two groups, it was revealed that the high apprehensives wrote shorter stories containing fewer T-units of shorter duration and that they were consistently evaluated less positively than their low apprehensive counterparts. These findings are corroborated in the research evidence provided by Book (1976), Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) and Garcia (1977). Generally, these studies have tended to conclude that an inverse relationship exists between writing apprehension and the quantitative and qualitative variables of the written language product. Hence, the extent to which writers avoid or approach the writing encounter affects the overall length of their stories, the number of T-units contained in the story, the

average number of words per T-unit and the general quality of the written product.

While Book (1976), Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) and Garcia (1977) focussed their studies upon the undergraduate student, the present study centered upon the grade six student. What is particularly salient about the findings of the present study is that the inverse relationship that was found to exist between writing apprehension and the quantitative and qualitative variables of the written language products produced by older students was also evident for younger students. To this end, therefore, disposition towards writing seems to affect a number of quantitative and qualitative variables related to the written product in young writers as well as older writers.

Writing apprehension in this study has been defined as the tendency to avoid situations requiring writing. Daly (1979) and others suggest that previous writing success may enhance or inhibit disposition towards future writing encounters. Moreover, Daly (1985) indicated that Harvley-Felder (1978) found that "... high apprehensives reported more punishment, (and) less positive reinforcement" (p.27). It seems, therefore, that the negative writing experiences reported by the high apprehensive writers may produce negative feelings about writing which may cause them to avoid future writing situations. To this end, it does not seem surprising that high

apprehensives write shorter stories because it limits their involvement in a situation which they perceive negatively. Moreover, in their attempt to rush through the writing encounter, high apprehensives may direct less attention to the variables which determine the qualitative aspects of their stories.

Although story length does not bear a direct relationship with the qualitative assessment of the written product, shorter stories may limit the organization and elaboration of the ideas contained in the story and this in turn may negatively affect the quality of the written product as measured by such variables as vocabulary. To this end, the tendency for high apprehensive writers to avoid the writing encounter, to hurry while involved in the writing situation and to generate abbreviated stories may be viewed as a debilitating handicap for several reasons. First, infrequent writing encounters offer fewer opportunities to develop writing skills. Secondly, as the gap between their writing growth and the expectations of teachers widen as children progress through the grades, greater apprehension may result, reinforcing negative attitudes and increasing their avoidance of the writing encounter.

Whether or not poor writing skills result in high writing apprehension or high writing apprehension produces poor writing skills is open to question. Research designed to explore these questions are, to the best knowledge of the researcher,

extremely limited. Daly (1985) suggests that research investigating the causes and the conditions which maintain writing apprehension "... suffers from considerable ethical problems (because this research would involve) ... the systematic attempt to create writing apprehension" (p.26).

Nevertheless, research evidence does suggest that high writing apprehensives generally exhibit not only poorer writing skills but also less writing growth when compared to their low apprehensive counterparts. Unless other factors intervene, therefore, one could suggest that the low apprehensive students in the present study will continue to hone their writing skills and will continue to exhibit writing growth much more than the high apprehensive students.

The written products of the low apprehensive writers in the present study tended to be twice as long and were evaluated at least two times more favorably than the written products of their high apprehensive counterparts. Hence, the writing confidence exhibited by the low apprehensive writers may allow them to elaborate upon their thinking in the written mode which may result in longer and better developed stories. Moreover, their willingness to approach the writing encounter may allow for frequent opportunities to develop their writing skills. To this end, therefore, low writing apprehension in the present study may be viewed as an enabling characteristic.

The low apprehensive group scored three times as many

points for vocabulary as did the high apprehensive group. Generally, low apprehensive writers demonstrated concern for using precision, variety and vividness in the lexical choices they used to articulate their ideas in writing. Hence, low apprehensive writers demonstrated greater language proficiency in that they generated more precise language and manipulated the language to convey their intended meanings in writing.

The Writing Process

This section investigated the following three research questions:

4. What is the nature of the writing process employed by high apprehensive writers?

5. What is the nature of the writing process employed by low apprehensive writers? and

6. How are the writing processes employed by the high apprehensive and low apprehensive groups similar and/or different?

Discussion

Statements made about the writing process revealed that students comprising both groups were most concerned about the major category labelled "Planning". Within this category students exhibit concern for the ideas which could be used in the story. The next most frequent classification of statements

reflected concern for the major category labelled "Translating". Within this category students orally rehearsed their ideas before writing about them. While the Planning and Translating categories comprised 75% of the statements made about the writing process by the high apprehensive group, they comprised 61% of the statments made by the low apprehensive group. Hence, the statements made about the writing process reveal that both high and low apprehensive students are concerned about generating ideas which could be used in their stories and that they frequently transform these ideas into oral language before committing them to paper.

The high apprehensive group verbalized fewer statements related to the Editing and/or Revising Category (5%) than their low apprehensive counterparts (27%). For the most part, students comprising both groups verbalized statements which exhibited concern for correcting the surface features of the story. However, the low apprehensive group did verbalize more statements concerned with correcting the ideas contained in the story than students in the high apprehensive group. Hence, low apprehensive students appear to be more concerned about the correctness of their stories, not only the surface features of the stories but also the ideas contained in the stories than students in the high apprehensive group. Low apprehensive students have confidence in their writing abilities and expect to be evaluated positively and to this end, therefore, they may

focus increased attention upon perfecting the surface features of their stories and the ideas they include in their writing.

Statements made about the writing process indicated that high apprehensive students exhibited less audience awareness and that they were less concerned about the production of a written piece than low apprehensive students. Several factors account for this conclusion. First, the high apprehensive writers tended to accept rather than reject the ideas they generated. Low apprehensive writers, on the other hand, frequently stated that they rejected an idea because it would not make sense to the reader. Secondly, high apprehensive writers demonstrated that once an idea was generated and selected that they showed little concern about how to phrase the idea. The low apprehensive group frequently asked such questions as "how should I phrase this?". These questions demonstrated that they were not only concerned with the idea that would be included in the story but they were also concerned about the intent and phrasing of the idea.

While statements made about the writing process revealed little concern on the part of either group for evaluating either the written product and/or the students' writing abilities, differences in the types of evaluations that did occur were discerned. For the most part, high apprehensives appraised negatively and the low apprehensives appraised positively. Hence, low apprehensive students tended to exhibit

confidence in what they wrote and felt themselves to be capable writers. The high apprehensives, on the other hand, lacked confidence in their writing abilities and viewed their written products in a negative vein, often indicating that their stories would not be evaluated positively by others. What may account for the differences in the types of appraisals exhibited by students comprising each of the groups are the previous types of writing encounters and previous types of evaluations they experienced. Research has indicated that low apprehensives have experienced success in their writing and tended to be evaluated positively for their writing which may result in positive attitudes with respect to their own writing abilities and the written products they produce. To this end, low apprehensives extend their experiences and expectations of success to other writing encounters. The same is not true for high apprehensive writers. Generally, their writing experiences and the types of evaluations they have encountered have many negative overtones which may cause them to view their writing abilities and their written products in a negative light.

The Relationship Between the Written Product and the Writing Process

This section explored one major research question:

Is there a relationship between the written products and the writing processes of high apprehensive and low apprehensive writers ?

Discussion

The present study found that low apprehensive writers wrote longer stories and were evaluated more positively than high apprehensive writers. Statements made about the writing process indicated that low apprehensives verbalized twice as many statements as high apprehensives. To this end, story length may contribute to the number of statements that are made about the writing process. That is longer stories may invite more comments about the writing process than shorter stories.

Even though high apprehensives verbalized more statements which showed concern for the generation of ideas, they did not include as many ideas in their writing as indicated by the number of T-units in their stories when compared to their low apprehensive counterparts. Moreover, the ideas contained in the stories of high apprehensives were not as well developed as the ideas contained in the stories of low apprehensives. Hence, the number of statements exhibiting concern for the

generation of ideas does not seem to bear a relationship with the number of ideas that are contained in the story nor the extent to which these ideas are developed in writing. Perhaps, high apprehensives possess the ability to generate ideas in the oral mode but are less capable of expressing these ideas in the written mode. The low apprehensive writer, on the other hand, may have generated ideas covertly and in not verbalizing these ideas affected the frequency counts of the statements that are related to the generation of ideas.

Low apprehensive writers verbalized more statements which demonstrated concern for the specificity and elaboration of ideas than high apprehensive students. This had a positive impact upon the qualitative evaluations of the written language products produced by low apprehensive writers. Hence, concern for the specificity and the elaboration of ideas may result in the positive appraisals of written language products. Generally, low apprehensive students elaborated upon major events in the story by including a number of supporting details and they demonstrated concern for specifying character names and places in the story. A number of statements also indicated that low apprehensive students were concerned about including lexical choices which would convey their intended meanings precisely.

Low apprehensive students verbalized more statements which demonstrated concern for editing and/or revising their written

work than high apprehensive students. Although both groups tended to revise the surface features of the written product, the low apprehensive group demonstrated greater concern for correcting the ideas of the story. Concern for story content by the low apprehensive group was also exhibited in the number of ideas they rejected. Moreover, the low apprehensive group was evaluated more positively for such features as organization, elaboration and structure which focus upon the ability to arrange ideas in logical order, to generate a number of ideas which flow smoothly from one idea to the next and to use language forms which convey meaning. To this end, therefore, the number of statements which revealed concern for correcting the ideas in the story and the number of statements which demonstrated the ability to reject unacceptable ideas may be related to the quality of the final written product. In correcting and rejecting unacceptable ideas, low apprehensive students are more likely to produce stories with logical ideas that flow smoothly from one idea to the next expressed in vivid and appropriate word choice.

The Profiles

This section supplemented the findings with respect to the individual research questions and presented the profiles of one high apprehensive student and one low apprehensive student.

Conclusions reached about the profiles are presented below.

Discussion

In spite of the fact that group similarities and differences can be discerned with respect to the written products produced, and writing processes employed, by high and low apprehensive writers, the profiles seemed to indicate that differences within the group also exist revealing that the writing encounter is also unique to the individual writer. The written products and the statements made about the writing process of Cynthia, the high apprehensive writer, and Sue, the low apprehensive writer, exhibited many similarities with group findings. However, a number of individual differences were also noted.

Although Cynthia verbalized 101 statements about the writing process, her story contained only 162 words. Sue, on the other hand, only verbalized 47 statements but her story contained 1068 words. Hence, a previously stated conclusion that story length influences the number of statements made about the writing process should be tempered with concern for the individual writer. The greater number of statements made about the writing process by Cynthia may reside in her tendency to pause frequently while writing in order to generate the next idea. These ideas were, for the most part, verbalized and

included in the frequency count of the number of statements made about the writing process. Sue, on the other hand, tended to write for longer periods of time. She generated ideas as she wrote and therefore verbalized fewer statements about the writing process.

Previously, it had been suggested that story length may contribute to the qualitative evaluation of the written product. This finding was also supported in the profiles of the two students. Cynthia wrote fewer words and was evaluated less positively than Sue who wrote a lengthy story containing 1068 words. Hence, the relationship between the qualitative evaluation of the written product and story length appears to hold true for both group comparisons and within group comparisons. That is, within her group Cynthia's story contained the least number of words and was evaluated least positively. Within her group, Sue wrote the longest story and her story was evaluated most positively. Perhaps longer stories allow for greater elaboration of the central ideas that are contained in the story or elaboration results in longer stories.

Retrospective comments about the writing session indicated that both students relied upon a number of strategies to generate the ideas which could be included in the story. In talking about the strategies they used, however, Sue exhibited a greater number of strategies and indicated greater concern

for generating ideas which would capture reader interest. This was not found to be true for Cynthia. The strategies she used demonstrated that she was most concerned about generating any kind of idea without regard for the type of reader interest it would generate. To this end, therefore, both students relied on strategies which would help them to generate ideas which could be used in the story but the way in which these strategies were used differed.

While Sue revealed that she relied upon a number of strategies to edit and/or revise her work, Cynthia did not verbalize such strategies during the retrospective comment phase. Cynthia did correct errors while composing but did not reveal the types of strategies she used. Sue, however, appeared to be quite cognizant of the types of strategies that were available to her for producing a quality story. To this end, therefore, low apprehensive students, like Sue, may possess greater knowledge, and employ a greater variety, of editing and/or revising strategies.

Pianko (1979) suggests that the writing process is linear, recursive and simultaneous in nature. A similar conclusion can be drawn from the analysis of the writing profiles of Sue and Cynthia. Both students indicated in their statements about the writing process that they generated ideas while writing, revealing the simultaneous nature of the writing process. The process also had a backward and foreward movement in that they

edited and revised ideas recursively. In addition, Sue frequently reread parts of her story in order to generate new ideas. The linear nature of the writing process was exemplified in the types of statements which indicated that both Sue and Cynthia generated ideas about the beginning of the story before generating ideas for the middle or the end of the story. To this end, therefore, it appears that the students used to profile one high and low apprehensive writer revealed the linear, recursive and simultaneous nature of the writing process.

Both students commented retrospectively about the role of writing in their lives. Sue indicated that she enjoyed writing and that she wrote prolifically both at home and at school. She indicated that she was not concerned about being evaluated by others and that she in fact welcomed the challenge of having others read her work. Cynthia, however, indicated that she did not enjoy writing, that she avoided it and that she felt uncertain about her writing abilities. Hence, Sue,a low apprehensive writer, tended to exhibit a positive attitude about writing and confidence in her writing abilities. Cynthia, however, exhibited negative attitudes about writing, choosing to avoid it whenever possible and lacking confidence in her writing abilitiies. To this end, Sue and Cynthia exhibit many of the characteristics of the prototypical low and high apprehensive writer delineated in the literature and

research studies.

Implications For Teaching

The present study indicated that writing apprehension is not simply peculiar to the older student as most of the research seems to indicate. Writing apprehension also occurs at a very young age. This seems to suggest that from a very young age children begin to internalize the types of evaluations teachers make about their writing and that this very quickly affects the attitudes children develop about writing and that this also affects disposition towards future writing encounters. Elementary students are at the beginning stages of developing mastery in the skills required for good writing and to this end, therefore, elementary teachers should recognize and be aware of the writing apprehension construct.

Although research has not established that writing apprehension causes poor writing skills, the present study found that high apprehensive writers exhibit less writing mastery than low apprehensive writers. Therefore, when students consistently exhibit poor writing skills, it may well be educationally sound to focus attention upon the attitudes students have about writing rather than focusing attention upon the written product as a means of developing writing skills. In reversing negative attitudes, students may begin to enjoy

the writing encounter, write more frequently and thereby develop writing abilities and improved products more easily and with less frustration.

The analysis of statements made about the writing process by each of the children who participated in this study indicated that different students focussed upon different parts of the composing process. This insight became especially apparent in the analysis of the writing profiles of two student writers. To this end, it may be vital for teachers to be aware not only of the various components of the writing process but also the nature of each of the components. Moreover, it may also be important for teachers to become more cognizant about understanding the individual student in terms of his or her disposition towards writing and understand how attitudes toward writing affect the written product and the writing process. In increasing the understanding of the writing process and the effects of attitudes upon the writing process and the written product, teachers may be able to implement a writing program that focusses upon the individual child and the process of writing rather than the product of writing.

Focussing writing instruction upon the individual student and his or her attitudes toward writing may also help teachers to become more aware of the strengths and weaknesses each child possesses. The present research, for example, has found that high apprehensives tend to truncate their ideas while they

write. That is, even though high apprehensives generate many ideas and spend a large proportion of their planning time on generating ideas for inclusion in the story, these students tend to write abbreviated versions of the ideas they have generated. The low apprehensive students, on the other hand, elaborate upon the ideas they have generated while they write. The elaboration that occurs in the written products of low apprehensive writers generally tends to result in more positive evaluations. To this end, therefore, it may be educationally sound to model the elaboration of ideas while writing for the high apprehensive student.

Low apprehensive writers in this study were evaluated three times more positively than the high apprehensive writers for the feature which focussed upon vocabulary usage. This tended to suggest that low apprehensive writers were more capable of manipulating and generating language than their high apprehensive counterparts. Since, the abilities of low apprehensive writers to generate vivid words and phrases resulted in more positive evaluations, teachers may wish to design programs that would facilitate the development of these abilities in high apprehensive students. These programs may initially involve a great deal of oral language development.

In contrast to the high apprehensives, low apprehensives exhibited concern for audience. That is, in commenting about their stories low apprehensives were concerned about generating

stories that were interesting to the reader. They were also concerned about the logical sequence inherent in their stories because they voiced concern that if the story was not logical, it would not make sense to the reader. The high apprehensive writers, on the other hand, did not express similar concerns. Because low apprehensive writers were concerned about writing stories which would be interesting to a reader, they wrote stories that were much better developed and logical than the stories written by high apprehensive writers. It would seem, therefore, that high apprehensive writers should probably be exposed to having a variety of audiences read their writing. Knowing beforehand that an audience such as a teacher, a parent or students in other grades will read their stories, may help students to develop a better sense of audience and write stories to suit that specific audience.

Research evidence suggests that high apprehensive writers avoid writing and develop negative attitudes about writing because of prior experiences in the writing encounter. In their experiences high apprehensive writers tended to be evaluated less positively and received more punishment than their low apprehensive counterparts. To this end, it appears that teachers' comments and evaluations of students' written products can influence the types of attitudes students develop about writing. It appears educationally sound, therefore, to have teachers come to understand the impact their comments

about students' writing may have upon the attitudes students develop about writing.

Since high writing apprehensives have very little confidence in their writing abilities, they tend to avoid the writing encounter whenever possible. In avoiding writing, they have fewer opportunities to develop writing skills. To this end, teachers should build confidence in the students by praising and rewarding work that shows any kind of improvement. Increasing writing confidence within students may help them to build a better self-concept about their writing abilities and this in turn may positively affect their disposition towards writing.

The present study indicated that writing apprehension is not simply peculiar to the older student as most of the research seems to indicate. Writing apprehension also occurs at a very young age. This seems to suggest that from a very young age children begin to internalize the types of evaluations teachers make about their writing and that this very quickly affects the attitudes children develop about writing and that this also affects disposition towards future writing encounters. Elementary students are at the beginning stages of developing mastery in the skills required for good writing and to this end, therefore, elementary teachers should recognize and be aware of the writing apprehension construct.

Although research has not established that writing

apprehension causes poor writing skills, the present study found that high apprehensive writers exhibit less writing mastery than low apprehensive writers. Therefore, when students consistently exhibit poor writing skills, it may well be educationally sound to focus attention upon the attitudes students have about writing rather than focussing attention upon developing the writing skills themselves. In reversing negative attitudes, students may begin to enjoy the writing encounter, write more frequently and thereby develop writing skills more easily and with less frustration.

The analysis of statements made about the writing process by each of the children who participated in this study indicated that different students focussed upon different parts of the composing process. This insight became especially apparent in the analysis of the writing profiles of two student writers. To this end, it may be vital for teachers to be aware not only of the various components of the writing process but also the nature of each of the components. In understanding the nature of the writing process, teachers may be able to implement a writing program that focusses upon the process of writing rather than the product of writing.

Recommendations For Further Research

This study examined the relationship between writing apprehension and the written product and the writing process. It focussed upon four high apprehensive students and four low apprehensive students at the grade six level who were engaged in a singular narrative writing task.

Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) concluded in their study which involved undergraduate students that different modes of written discourse revealed different effects upon the written products produced by high and low apprehensive writers. In this study only the narrative mode was used, placing inherent limitations upon this study. To this end, therefore, future research could compare and contrast the written products and the writing processes of apprehensive students at the elementary level by focussing upon a number of different types of writing tasks. Insight into the relationship between writing apprehension and the various types of written discourse may help teachers to implement more effective writing programs which reveal concern not only for the written product and the writing process but also the affective dimensions of young student writers.

Research investigating the writing apprehension construct has primarily focussed upon high school and undergraduate students. The present study indicates that writing

apprehension is also evident in students at the grade six level. Since the development of writing apprehension is thought to occur from the experiences of previous writing encounters, future research might investigate the development of this construct. One could, for example, follow a group of students from grade one to grade six and examine how and why this phenomenon develops. This type of research could reveal more explicitly the developmental factors of writing apprehension and suggest more clearly the means for impeding the onset of writing apprehension in students.

Research evidence suggests that one factor which may contribute to the development of the writing apprehension construct is the type of evaluations teachers give to the written products of students. To this end, therefore, future research could identify a number of elementary aged apprehensive writers and examine how more positive reinforcement for their writing behaviour will influence their disposition to future writing encounters and if their written products show increas mastery of writing skills as a result.

Research evidence suggests that high writing apprehensives lack confidence in their writing abilities. They have experienced negative feelings within the writing encounter and to this end avoid writing whenever possible. Children with a poor self-image or children possessing a negative self-concept also experience and feel negative about themselves and the

various kinds of abilities they have. To this end, therefore further research could investigate the extent to which high writing apprehension is related to self-concept.

Summary

This chapter summarized the conclusions about the relationship between writing apprehension and the written product and the writing process. It also revealed a number of implications for teaching and suggested a number of ideas for future research.

REFERENCES

References

Baker, W. D. An investigation of characteristics of poor writers. College Composition and Communication. 1954, 5, 23-27.

Barnes, D., Britton, J., Rosen, H. Language, the learner and the school. New York: Penguin Books Ltd., 1969.

Beach, R. Self evaluation strategies of extensive revisers and non revisers. College Composition and Communication, 1976, 27, 160-164.

Boohar, R. K. and Seiler, W. J. Speech communication anxiety: An impediment to academic achievement in the university classroom. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 1984, 18, 23-27.

Book, V. Some effects of apprehension on writing performance. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED. 132 595, 1976.

Britton, J., Burgess, A., Martin, N., McLeod, A. and Rosen, H. The development of writing abilities. London: McMillan, 1975.

Cannon, W. Terrors and affectations: Students' perceptions of the writing process. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 199 720, 1982.

Daly, J. A. Writing apprehension. In M. Rose (Ed.) Writing Blocks. N.Y.: Guildford Press (in press).

Daly, J. A. The effects of writing apprehension on message encoding. Journalism Quarterly, 1977, 54, 566-572.

Daly, J. A. Writing apprehension in the classroom: Teacher role expectancies of the apprehensive writer. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979, 13, 37-44.

Daly, J. A. and Miller, M. D. The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in the teaching of English, 1975, 9, 242-249.

Daly, J. A. and Shamo, W. G. Writing apprehension and occupational choice. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 1976, 49, 57-62.

Daly, J. A. and Shamo, W. G. Academic decisions as a function of writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979, 12, 119-126.

Daly, J. A. and Wilson, D. A. Writing apprehension, self-esteem, and personality. Research in the Teaching of English, 1983, 17, 327-341.

Emig, J. The composing processes of twelfth graders (Research report no. 13). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971.

Fagan, W. T., Jensen, J. M., and Cooper, C. R. Measures for research and evaluation in the English language arts, volume 2. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1985.

Faigley, L., Daly, J. and Witte, S. The role of apprehension in writing performance and competence. Journal of Educational Research, 1981, 75, 16-21.

Garcia, R. J. An investigation of relationships: Writing apprehension, syntactic performance, and writing quality. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1977.

Gaudry, E. and Bradshaw, G. D. The differential effect of anxiety on performance in progressive and terminal school examinations. In E. Gaudry and C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), Anxiety and educational achievement. Sydney: John Wiley and Sons Australasia Pty. Ltd., 1971.

Glassner, B. J. Preliminary report: Hemispheric relationships in composing. In Ann Humes Research on the composing process. Review of Educational Research, 1983, 53 (2), 201-206.

Gould, J. D. Experiments on composing letters: Some facts, some myths, and some observations. In Ann Humes Research on the composing process. Review of Educational Research, 1983, 53 (2), 201-206.

Graves, D. H. An examination of the writing processes of seven year old children. Research in the Teaching of English, 1975, 9, 227-241.

Graves, D. H. Writing: Teachers and children at work. New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, 1983.

Harvley-Felder, Z. C. Some factors relating to writing apprehension: An exploratory study. In M. Rose (Ed.) Writing Blocks. N.Y.: Guildford Press (in press).

Hayes, C. G. Exploring apprehension: Composing processes of apprehensive and non-apprehensive intermediate freshmen writers. In M. Rose (Ed.) Writing Blocks. N.Y.: Guildford Press (in press).

Hayes, J. R. and Linda S. Flower. Identifying the organization of the writing process. In L. W. Gregg and E. R. Steinberg (Eds.) Cognitive processes in writing. Hillsdale, N. J. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publ. 1980.

Holladay, S. W. Writing anxiety: What research tells us. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED. 216 393, 1981.

Humes, A. Research on the composing process. Review of Educational Research, 1983, 53 (2), 201-206.

Loban, W. The language of elementary school children. Champaign, Illinois: N.C.T.E., 1963.

Martin, D. W. The sex factor in grading compositions. Research in the Teaching of English, 1972, 6, 36-47.

Martin, N., D'Arcy, P., Newton, B., Parker, R. Writing and learning across the curriculum. London: Biddles Ltd., 1976.

McCandless, B. R. and Castenada, A. Anxiety in children, school achievement and intelligence. Child Development, 1956, 27, 378-382.

McCroskey, J. C. Classroom consequences of communication apprehension. communication Education, 1977, 26, 27-33.

McCroskey, J. C. On communication competence and communication apprehension: A response to Page. Communication Education, 1980, 29, 109-11.

Nolan, F. M. Composing processes of grade six able writers. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1978.

Nold, E. W. Revising. In C. H. Frederiksen and J. F. Dominic (Eds.), Writing: The nature, development and teaching of written communication, Volume 2. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publ., 1981.

Oller, J. W. Language tests at school. London: Longman Group Limited, 1979.

Perl, S. The composing processes of unskilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979, 13, 317-336.

Pianko, S. A description of the composing processes of college freshman writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979, 13, 5-22.

Selfe, C. L. The predrafting processes of four high and four low-apprehensive writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 1984, 18, 45-64.

Spielberger, C. D. The effects of manifest anxiety on academic achievement of college students. In E. Gaudry and C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), Anxiety and educational achievement. Sydney: John Wiley and Sons Australasia Pty. Ltd., 1971.

Squire, J. R. Composing and comprehending: Two sides of the same basic process. Language Arts, 1983, 60, 581-587.

Stallard, C. K. An analysis of the writing behaviors of good student writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 1974, 8, 206-218.

Veit, R. Reducing anxiety in writing instruction. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED. 199 718, 1980.

APPENDIX A

The Writing Apprehension Test

SELF-REPORT INSTRUMENT--REVISED

Directions: Below are a series of statements about writing. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. It is very important to be honest about your feelings. Some of the statements may seem repetitious but answer each statement according to how you feel. Your cooperation is very much appreciated. Thank you!

1. I avoid writing.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

3. I like to write my ideas down on paper.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

4. I don't like writing when I know that I will be evaluated.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

5. Writing in class is a frightening experience.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

6. I feel good when I hand my writing in to my teacher.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

7. When I start writing my mind goes blank.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

8. It is a waste of time to write my ideas down on paper.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

9. I would like to have my writing printed in a children's magazine like "Ranger Rick" or "Highlights."

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

10. I look forward to writing my ideas down on paper.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

11. I feel good about my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

12. I like to have my friehds read what I have written.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

13. I am nervous about writing.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

14. People seem to enjoy what I write.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

15. I enjoy writing.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

16. I never seem to be able to clearly write down my ideas.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

17. Writing is a lot of fun.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

18. I know I will do poorly when I write even before I begin.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

20. It is an enjoyable experience for me when I discuss my writing with others.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas when I begin to write.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

22. When I hand in my writing, I know that I will do poorly.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

23. It is easy for me to write good stories.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

24. I don't think I write as well as the other children in my class.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

25. I don't like having my writing evaluated.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

26. I am not good at writing.

1 Strongly agree 2 agree 3 not sure 4 disagree 5 strongly disagree

(Self-Report Instrument adapted from Daly and Miller, 1975)

APPENDIX B

The Sager Writing Scale

SAGER WRITING SCALE

VOCABULARY

DEFINITION

Vocabulary is the use of words to express a particular thought or idea.

RATE 3: A variety of new and interesting words and comparisons create vivid impressions.

Words help the reader use his senses.

Synonyms provide variety and interest.

Exact words paint vivid pictures.

Unusual expressions, word combinations, and comparisons add zest and color to the story.

RATE 2: Words are adequately descriptive and exact but lack over-all excellence.

Some words are descriptive and exact.

Some use of new and interesting words.

Some variety of word choice.

ORGANIZATION

DEFINITION

Organization is the arrangement of ideas in order.

RATE 3: Ideas are arranged in a way that is interesting and easy to follow.

Events are told in logical order.

A main idea ties all story parts together.

The beginning captures interest.

Action builds to a climax.

The conclusion sums up the story.

No irrelevant details.

RATE 2: There is a main idea, but some events are poorly arranged.

Some events are told out of order.

A main idea ties all story parts together.

VOCABULARY		ORGANIZATION	
DEFINITION		DEFINITION	
	Some vivid words and comparisons.		A good beginning and conclusion, but rambles without reaching a climax. No irrelevant details.
RATE 1:	A few interesting words but little variety of word choice. Uses vague general words more often than exact words. Few descriptive or picture words or phrases.	Rate 1:	A main idea but many irrelevant events. Many events are out of order. Weak beginning and/or ending.
Rate 0:	Only common, overworked words with no variety of word choice. Dull, uninteresting words.	Rate 0:	Over-all impression of disorder because of jumbled arrangement of ideas. There is no main idea or point to the story. There is no beginning, middle, or end. Many irrelevant details.

ELABORATION

DEFINITION

Elaboration is an abundance of related ideas which flow smoothly from one idea to the next:

RATE 3: A variety of related ideas helps the reader see, hear, and feel what the author intends.

Details make people, places, and/or events come alive.

Details make the reader feel what the characters feel.

Details and ideas create an impression on the reader.

All ideas are fully developed.

Ideas follow each other easily and naturally.

RATE 2: Ideas are clear but fail to make an impression on the reader.

Ideas follow each other easily and naturally but lack punch.

STRUCTURE

DEFINITION

Structure is the way in which language forms are used to convey meaning.

RATE 3: A variety of sentences which state ideas accurately, effectively, and fluently.

Each sentence is complete.

Sentences emphasize author's meaning.

A variety of sentences is used.

The story can be read aloud with ease.

RATE 2: Sentences state ideas accurately but not always effectively or fluently.

Almost all sentences are complete.

Some variety of sentences used.

ELABORATION

DEFINITION

Some details help the reader use his feelings.

Some ideas are fully developed.

some details are either inadequate or overdone.

RATE 1: Much more detail is needed.

Ideas are sometimes confusing and hard to follow.

Details are often inadequate.

Important questions are left unanswered.

STRUCTURE

DEFINITION

Sentences sometimes emphasize author's meaning.

Parts of the story sound stiff or uneven when read aloud.

RATE 1: Ideas are sometimes difficult to understand.

Some sentences are complete.

Some run-on sentences and sentence fragments.

Little variety of sentences.

Monotonous primer style.

Story is difficult to read aloud.